(U, D, L)

# VEDĀRTHA-SAṄGRAHA

OF

ŚRĪ RĀMĀNUJĀCĀRYA



ENGLISH TRANSLATION

BY

S. S. RAGHAVACHAR, M.A.

WITH A FOREWORD

BY

SWĀMĪ ĀDIDEVĀNANDA





SRI RAMAKRISHNA ASHRAMA
MYSORE
1978

THIRD EDITION 1978



*Published by:*

THE PRESIDENT
SRI RAMAKRISHNA ASHRAMA
MYSORE



*Printed:*

AT SHARADA PRESS
MANGALORE

## FOREWORD

Śrī Rāmānuja wrote nine works[1] in Sanskrit on the philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita. Of these, the *Vedārtha-saṅgraha* occupies a unique place inasmuch as this work takes the place of a commentary on the Upaniṣads, though not in a conventional sense or form. The work mirrors a total vision of the Upaniṣads, discussing all the controversial texts in a relevent, coherent manner. It is in fact an independent exposition of the philosophy of the Upanishads. Prof. M. Hiriyanna describes it as 'an independent treatise explaining in a masterly way his philosophic position, and pointing out the basis for it in the Upaniṣads'.[2] Sudarśana-sūri, the celebrated commentator on the *Śrī-bhāṣya* and the *Vedārtha-saṅgraha*, says that the work was expounded in the form of a lecture before Lord Śrīnivāsa at Tirumalai.[3] Thus it is his testament at the feet of the Lord whom he served throughout his life. Śrī Rāmānuja refers to this work more than once in his *Śrī-bhāṣya*.

The *Vedārtha-saṅgraha* is written in a lucid, vigorous prose without the usual divisions of chapters, but the structure of the thesis is developed in a scientific manner. Śrī Rāmānuja refers in this work to ancient teachers of theistic tradition, Bodhāyana, Ṭaṅka, Dramiḍa, Guhadeva, Kapardin and Bhāruci, besides his own teacher, Śrī Yāmunācārya.[4] Ṭanka and Dramida are quoted profusely to support his interpreta-

---

1 *Vedārtha-saṅgraha, Śrī-bhāṣya, Gītā-bhāṣya. Vedāntadīpa, Vedānta-sāra, Śaraṇāgati-gadya, Vaikuṇṭha-gadya, Śrīraṅga-gadya and Nityagrantha.*

2 *The Essentials of Indian Philosophy*, page, 176.

3 श्रीभाष्यकृदुपन्यस्तो यः श्रीशैलपतेः पुरः ।
वेदार्थसङ्ग्रहस्यास्य कुर्मः तात्पर्यदीपिकाम् ।

4 भगवद्बोधायन-टङ्क-द्रमिड-गुहदेव-कपर्दि-भारुचि-प्रभृत्यविगीतशिष्टपरिगृहीतपुरातनवेदवेदान्तव्याख्यानसुव्यक्तार्थ-श्रुतिनिकरनिदर्शितोऽयं पन्थाः ।
(*Vs.* par. 130)

tion. He takes abundant help from the *Brahmasūtras*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*. the *Manusmṛti* and other genuine *smṛtis* in the exposition of his philosophy.

At the outset Śrī Rāmānuja states that the Upaniṣads, which lay down the welfare of the whole world, move around three fundamental notions: (1) A seeker must acquire a true knowledge of the individual self and the Supreme; (2) he must devote himself to meditation, worship and the adoration of the Supreme; (3) this knowledge with discipline leads him to the realization of the Supreme. To put it briefly, the first affirms the tattva or the nature of the Reality, the second declares the hita or the means, and the third states the puruṣārtha or the ideal of human endeavour.

A chief difficulty in understanding the meaning of the Upaniṣads arises in determining the relation of Brahman to the individual self on the one hand, and to the non-sentient world on the other. There are some texts which declare that the world is only an appearance in the ultimate analysis. There are other texts which affirm that the world is not an appearance, but real and distinct.

Bhartṛprapañca, who was anterior to Śrī Śaṅkara, held that the self and the universe are identical with and different from Brahman, the triad constituting a unity in variety. That is to say, that the reality is at once *one* as Brahman and *many* as the self and the world. For example, an ocean consists of water, foam, waves, etc. As the water is real, so also are the foam, waves, etc. The world, which is a part and parcel of Brahman, is necessarily real. The import of all this is that according to this view the Upaniṣads teach the eternal difference and identity between Brahman on the one hand, and the self and the world on the other.[1]

---

1 See Śrī Śaṅkara's commentary on *Bṛ.* V. I, and Prof. Hiriyanna's monograph on Bhartṛprapañca.

Śrī Śaṅkara rejects the view of Bhatṛprapañca, because mutually contradictory attributes cannot be predicated of one and the same thing. According to Śrī Śaṅkara the passages which affirm manifoldness and reality of the world do not embody the essential teaching of the Upaniṣads. It is a concession made to the empirical view that demands a real world having causal connection with time-space. Since variety is but an appearance having no foundation in the ultimate Reality, the true essential doctrine of the Upaniṣads, according to him, is only pure unity. The individual self is nothing but Brahman itself appearing as finite due to limiting adjuncts which are superimposed on it.

Śrī Rāmānuja also attempts to systamatize the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, taking the cue from the ancient theistic philosophers. He recognises three lines of thought in the Upaniṣads concerning the relation between Brahman, the self and the world: (1) Passages which declare difference of nature between the world, the self and Brahman. Here the world is the non-sentient matter (acit) which is the object of experience, the self is the experiencing conscious subject (cit), and Brahman, the absolute ruling principle.[1] These may be named *analytical texts*. (2) Passages which teach that Brahman is the inner self of all entities which constitute his body. For instance, 'He who dwells in the earth and within the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, and who rules the earth within, he is thy Self, the ruler within, the immortal' etc. (*Bṛ. III, vii,* 3-23). These are called ghaṭaka-śrutis or *mediating texts*. (3) Passages which proclaim the unity of Brahman with the world in its causal as well as effected aspect. The famous text, 'That thou art, O Śvetaketu' (*Chā. VI* 2-8) comes under this category. These may be termed as *synthetic passages*. Śrī Rāmā-

1 See *Śve*. 1, 9-10, IV. 9-10, *Mahā*. XI. 3.

nuja lays down that the interpretation of the various passages must be such that they are not made to contradict each other, and not a single passage should be so interpreted as to be divested of its primary significance.[1]

The first group of texts distinguishes Brahman from the world and the individual selves. In a way it emphasizes the transcendent character of Brahman. The second group of texts declares Brahman to be the inner self of all entities. Neither the individual self nor the world can exist by itself. They are inseparably connected with Brahman as his body, and thus are controlled by him. These texts teach duality in so far as distinction is made between body and self, and unity in so far as the self, the substantive element, predominates over and controls the body, its attribute. The last group of texts aim at proclaiming the non-dual character of Brahman who alone constitutes the ultimate Reality. The self and the world, though distinct from each other and real, have a different value. They only exist as a mode or attribute of Brahman. They are comprehended in the reality of Brahman. They exist because Brahman exists.

On this principle of interpretation, Sri Ramanuja recognizes that the passages declaring distinction between Brahman, the world and the self, and those affirming Brahman to be the same in the causal as well as effected aspects, do not in any way contradict the mediating passages which declare that the individual selves and the world form the body of Brahman, and they in their causal state do not admit the distinction of names and forms while in the effected state they possess distinct character.

The notion of unity may be illustrated by the example, 'A purple robe'. Here purpleness is quite different from

---

1 . . . नानारूपाणां वाक्याणाम् अविरोधः, मुख्यार्थपरित्यागश्च यथा सम्भवति तथैव वर्णनीयं वर्णितं च । (*Vs.* par, 115)

robe. The latter is a substance while the former is an attribute. This integral and essential relation is not found in the case of a man wearing a wrist-watch. If the former relation is *inseparable* (apṛthaksiddhi), the latter is separable and external A word signifying attribute does not stop after denoting the usual meaning, but extends till it reaches the substantive. This is the true significance of an attribute. The individual selves and the world constitute the body of Brahman who is their inner self. Brahman is the integral principle without whom neither the self nor the world can exist. Hence all names finally denote him.

The way in which Śrī Rāmānuja interprets the famous text, 'That thou art' (Tat tvam asi) is unique. This is done by means of co-ordinate predication (sāmānādhikaraṇya). In a co-ordinate predication the identity of the substantive should not be established through the rejection of the natural significance of co-ordinate terms. The indentical import of terms taken in their natural signification should be brought out. The *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali defines co-ordinate predication thus: 'The signification of an identical entity by several terms which are applied to that entity on different grounds is co-ordinate predication.' In such a proposition the attributes not only should be distinct from each other but also different from the substance, though *inseparable* from it. In the illustration of a 'Purple robe', the basic substance is one and the same, though 'purpleness' and 'robeness' are different from it as well as from each other. That is how the unity of a 'Purple robe' is established. In the co-ordinate predication asserting indentity between 'that' and 'thou', Brahman himself with the self as his mode, having the self as his body, is pointed out.

---

1 भिन्नप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तानां शब्दानाम् एकस्मिन्नर्थे वृत्तिस्सामानाधिकरण्यम् ।

(*Vs.* par. 24)

The term 'thou' which usually stands for the self here stands for Brahman ('that') who is the indweller of the self and of whom the self is the mode as a constituent of his body. The term 'thou' does not mean the physical body or the individual self. Since Brahman has interpenetrated all matter and self, 'thou' signifies Brahman in the ultimate analysis. The term 'that' signifies Brahman himself as the ground of the universe and the soul of all individual selves. Hence in the identity of 'that' and 'thou' there is no rejection of the specific connotation of the co-ordinate terms. The upshot of the dictum is that the individual selves and the world, which are distinct and real attributes, are comprehended in Brahman. Brahman as the inner self of the jīva—Brahman as the ground of the universe are one. The central principle is that whatever exists as an attribute of a substance, that being *inseparable* from the substance is one with that substance.

Thus Śrī Rāmānuja upholds all the three streams of thoughts in the Upaniṣads, namely, unity, plurality and both. He himself clinches the argument: 'We uphold unity because Brahman alone exists with all other entities as his modes. We uphold both unity and plurality, as the one Brahman himself has all the physical and spiritual entities as his modes and thus exists qualified by a plurality. We uphold plurality as the three entities—the individual selves, the world and the supreme Lord—are mutually distinct in their substantive nature and attributes and there is no mutual transposition of their characteristics.'[1]

---

1 सर्वशरीरतया सर्वप्रकारं ब्रह्मैव अवस्थितमिति, अभेदः समर्थितः; एकमेव ब्रह्म नानाभूतचिदचिद्वस्तुप्रकारं नानात्वेन अवस्थितम् इति भेदाभेदौ; अचिद्वस्तुनश्च चिद्वस्तुनश्च ईश्वरस्य च स्वरूपस्वभाववैलक्षण्यात् असङ्कराच्च भेदः समर्थितः । (*Vs* pa-. 117)

## II

The *summum bonum* is the vision of the supreme Person, known as Brahman or Śrīman-Nārāyaṇa. The chief obstacle in the path towards perfection is the accumulation of evil tendencies. These can be destroyed only by the cultivation of good tendencies. This is followed by self-surrender which generates an inclination towards life divine. Then one has to acquire the knowledge of the Reality from the scriptures aided by the holy teachers. Then the practice of virtues like the control of mind and sense, austerity, purity, non-violence, compassion, etc., becomes easy. Nitya and naimittika duties are to be performed, and prohibited actions are to be avoided–the whole conduct being conceived as the worship of God. God, the embodiment of love and compassion, showers his grace on the aspirant, which puts an end to all his obstacles. Finally bhakti rises which is an enjoyment of bliss in itself. Bhakti is but meditation which has assumed the character of the most vivid and direct perception of the Supreme.

Śrī Rāmānuja, like his predecessor and teacher, Śrī Yāmunācārya, declares that bhakti succeeds the twofold training of the mind by karma and jñāna.[1] Karma-yoga is performance of duties of one's station in life with no thought of reaping any personal benefit in the spirit of *Gītā's* teachings. Karma that is performed in this manner cleanses the heart. Jñāna-yoga, which immediately follows the previous discipline, is meditation upon the individual self as distinct from matter like body, mind, etc., with which it is associated. It helps the aspirant to determine the true nature of one's self in relation to the Supreme. He realizes that he is absolutely subservient to God.

The discipline does not stop with the knowledge of one's self alone. It is incomplete without the knowledge of God.

---

1 ज्ञानयोगकर्मयोगसंस्कृतांतःकरणस्य इत्यर्थः । (*Vs.* par. 127)

Here the word bhakti does not connote the popular sense in which it is understood. Bhakti-yoga is loving meditation upon God. When the meditation attains the form of 'firm remembrance' (dhruvānusmṛtiḥ) characterised by intense love, the vision of the Supreme is attained. It must be mentioned here that the final release is attained after the dissolution of the body. One endowed with such bhakti and self-surrender attains the fitness to earn the grace of the Lord. This bhakti itself is upāsana or vidyā mentioned in the Upaniṣads. It is same as knowledge spoken of in the śrutis: 'One who *knows* Brahman attains the Supreme' (*Tai. II*, 1), 'He who *knows* him becomes immortal here' (*Pu.* 20), and 'He who *knows* Brahman becomes Brahman' (*Mu. III*, *ii*, 9). As the vision of the Supreme is not possible through ordinary means of perception, he can be *seen* only through bhakti, which is a unique form of knowledge. This is in consonance with the *Gītā* declaration, 'I am attainable only through undivided bhakti' (*XI*, 54).

## III

It was already mentioned that the ideal to be realized is the vision of the Supreme. It is an experience of absolute peace, perfection, bliss and freedom, untouched by the cosmic limitations of space and time. Śrī Rāmānuja is accused of having given a 'picturesque description' of the ideal realm. But a little insight into the spirit of his writings reveals that the ideal is not such a fairyland as it is made out to be. The domain, he points out, is of the nature of pure immutable sattva. It is transcendent without the taints of the material guṇas of sattva, rajas and tamas. Similarly the individual self also, in the state of mokṣa, gives up its material body and assumes a transcendent form. The substance of śuddha-sattva is common to God, the self and the realm of the ideal known as nitya-vibhūti. The first chapter of the Kauṣītaki

Upaniṣad gives a figurative account of the pilgrim's progress till he reaches the feet of God.

The individual self is the essence of knowledge. This knowledge in its attributive aspect (dharma-bhūta-jñāna) gets more or less contracted in samsāra, but it expands infinitely in the state of mokṣa. It becomes all-knowing and enjoys perfect bliss and love in divine communion. In short it is an ineffable enjoyment. In this natural state it yields its spirit to the will, glory and adoration of God. Śrī Rāmānuja characterises this state as 'ananya-prayojana' having no other end except itself. In this ideal place there is no break in the enjoyment of divine communion.

Śrī Rāmānuja is not unaware of the criticism that there is subservience to and dependence upon God in his conception of mokṣa. The critics say that subordination in any form cannot conduce to the joy of self. The divine fetters are not less strong to bind. Further Manu says that servitude is a dog's life. Śrī Rāmānuja effectively meets this criticism in his characteristic way. He enunciates a principle 'that what an individual pursues as a desirable end depends upon what he conceives himself to be'.[1] Different people pursue different and mutually conflicting values. Hence the notion that independence is happiness proceeds from the misconception that one is identical with the body, mind, etc. This attachment to the body is a sort of dependence itself. Instead of dependence on God, it is dependence on matter. The metaphysical fact is that he is not the body, and consequently there must be something else with which his self is related. There cannot be relation of the principal entity and the subsidiary (śeṣin and śeṣa) between any finite objects. The only object with which such a relation can exist is God. Hence dependence on anything other than God is painful and

---

1 आत्माभिमानो यादृशः तदनुगुणैव पुरुषार्थप्रतीतिः । (*Vs.* par. 245)

subservience to God is joy and freedom. Similarly bondage is indeed a dog's life when one serves those who are unworthy of service. The only entity which is worthy of love, adoration and service is God. Śrī Rāmānuja clinches the issue by quoting a text, 'He is to be served by all'.[1] The emancipation consists in service of God, and true bondage is independence of God and service of body.

Sri S. S. Raghavachar, who is a deep student of philosophy, especially of Viśiṣṭādvaita, has achieved a large measure of success in his difficult task of translation. The learned translator has done a signal service to the students of philosophy by translating this masterly treatise of Śrī Rāmānuja. I am sure that it will prove to be of great help to the students of Indian philosophy.

SWĀMĪ ĀDIDEVĀNANDA

1 स ह्याश्रमैः सदोपास्यः समस्तैः एक एव तु । (*Vs*. par. 150)

# PREFACE

It was nearly two years ago and to be more exact, it was on the birthday of Śrī Rāmānuja in the year 1954 that the idea occured to me of the desirability of rendering *Vedārtha-saṅgraha* into English. The work has struck all students as a magnificent treatise on account of the comprehensiveness of its theme, its vigour of execution and the luminous style of its prose. I immediately communicated my thought to Swami Adidevananda. He wrote to me promptly commanding me to take up the task and promised all possible help. I set myself to the work and submitted my draft to him for scrutiny, and another copy was submitted to Pandit Hemmige Desikachar. After collecting the detailed observations of the Swami and the criticisms and suggestions of Pandit Desikachar I rewrote the whole translation incorporating all the help thus offered. By the time my work was completed, it came to my notice that nearly fifty years ago a translation of the work had appeared serially in the *Brahmavādin* of Madras. It was too late for me to benefit from the first translation. So the new translation presented here is an independent one.

The translation is based completely on the *Tātparya-dīpika* of Śrī Sudarśana-sūri whose guidance in the matter of understanding Śrī Rāmānuja is indispensable and is most illuminating.

I acknowledge with sincere gratitude the help I have received from Pandit H. Desikachar, Sri K. V. S. Tatachar, Sri N. S. Anantarangachar, Vidvan Selva Pillai Sarma and Pandit D. Tangavelan. My indebtedness to Swami Adidevananda is indeed beyond words. He has criticized and guided me at every stage of my work. It is in the fitness of things that the work should go forth with his masterly foreword.

The difficulty in translating a work of this kind is that the grandeur of the original produces deep discontent with one's poor rendering of it. Under this circumstance the translator must satisfy himself with the twin aims of accuracy and intelligibility. The power and beauty of the original are beyond reproduction. How far I have achieved my modest aims I leave it to others to judge. Personally the experience of translation has been a reward in itself as it has enabled me considerably to get into grips with the architectonics of a classic in the philosophy of the Upaniṣads. I have put on record my analysis of the text and connected reflections in the form of a detailed introduction which is being published by The Mangalore Trading Association (Private) Limited.

Swami Shambhavananda with his characteristic generosity and readiness to help, agreed to publish the work. I acknowledge most gratefully my indebtedness to him for giving my humble work the sanctifying recognition of the great Order bearing the name of Sri Ramakrishna. I am grateful to Swami Somanathananda for the kind interest he took in the work and for making the necessary arrangement for its publication.

I acknowledge with sincere gratitude the uniform courtesy and good work of the management of the Sharada Press. My particular thanks are due to Sri A. S. Kamath, who took a personal interest in the work and has expeditiously brought out the book in a fine form.

In preparing the text I have consulted three editions and have depended throughout on the reading adopted by the *Tātparya-dīpikā*. The editions consulted are:

1. The edition in Telugu characters published by the Saraswati Bhandara, Madras, in 1883.

2. The Devanagari edition of Pandit Rama Misra Sastri published by Messrs. E. J. Lazarus & Co., Benares, in 1924.

3. The Devanagari edition in the Sri Vaishnava Sampradaya Granthamala, published by T. T. Devasthanams, Tirupati, in 1953.

The work is offered in the devout spirit of service.

S. S. RAGHAVACHAR

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Ā* | .. | Taittirīya Āraṇyaka |
| *Ai* | .. | Aitareya Upaniṣad |
| *Atharva* | .. | Atharvaśikha Upaniṣad |
| *Bhā.* | .. | Mahābhārata |
| *Bṛ.* | .. | Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad |
| *Bṛ. Mā.* | .. | Bṛhadaraṇyaka Upanisad (Mādhyandina) |
| *Bra.* | .. | Brahmasūtras |
| *Chā.* | .. | Chāndogya Upaniṣad |
| *Gītā* | .. | Bhagavadgītā |
| *Īśa.* | .. | Īśa Upaniṣad |
| *Ka.* | .. | Kaṭha Upaniṣad |
| *Kau.* | .. | Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad |
| *Ma.* | .. | Manusmṛti |
| *Mahā.* | .. | Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad |
| *Matsya.* | .. | Matsya-purāṇa |
| *Mī.* | ... | Mīmāṁsā-sūtras |
| *Mu.* | .. | Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad |
| *Pu.* | .. | Puruṣa-sūkta |
| *Rā.* | .. | Rāmāyaṇa (Vālmīki) |
| *Ṛg.* | .. | Ṛgveda |
| *Ślo.* | .. | Śloka-vārtika |
| *Śri.* | .. | Śrī-bhāṣya |
| *Śve.* | .. | Śvetaśvatara Upaniṣad |
| *Su.* | .. | Subāla Upaniṣad |
| *Tai.* | .. | Taittirīya Upaniṣad |
| *Vi.* | .. | Viṣṇu-purāṇa |
| *Vs.* | .. | Vedārtha-saṅgraha |
| *Ya.* | .. | Yajurveda |

# CONTENTS

Paragraphs

1. Priliminary statement of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads . . . . 1-2
2. Substance of Advaita philosophy . . 3
3. Bhāskara's view . . . . 4
4. Yādavaprakāśa's view . . . 5
5. Examination of the first view
   (a) In the light of scriptures . . 6-44
   (b) In terms of pure reason . . 45-67
6. Examination of Bhāskara's view . . 68-74
7. Examination of Yādavaprakāśa's view . 75-80
8. Constructive standpoint
   (a) Tattvamasi . . . 81-87
   (b) Brahman as the material cause . 88-93
   (c) Brahman is the import of all terms . 94-98
   (d) The heart of the scriptures . . 99-108
   (e) The classification, interpretation and reconciliation of the various types of sacred texts . . . 109-122
   (f) The question of the freedom of will . 123-125
   (g) Parābhakti, the means for attaining Brahman. . . . 126-130
9. Nārāyaṇa is the supreme Brahman . . 131-166
10. Refutation of the Prābhākara conception of śruti . . . . . 167-197
11. The scriptures on the transcendent divine form, Śrī, the eternal seers and the transcendent abode of the Lord . . . 198-226
12. The nature of the Vedas . . . 227-233
13. Summary of the metaphysical principles . 234-237
14. Summary of the doctrine of sādhana as bhakti 238-243
15. Service of the Lord . . 244-250
16. Concluding words on bhakti . 251-252

॥ श्रीः ॥

श्रीभगवद्रामानुजमुनिविरचितः

# वेदार्थसङ्ग्रहः

अशेषचिदचिद्वस्तुशेषिणे शेषशायिने ।
निर्मलानन्तकल्याणनिधये विष्णवे नमः ॥ १ ॥

I offer adoration to Viṣṇu, the all-pervading supreme Being, who is the overlord of all sentient and non-sentient entities, who reposes on the primordial Śeṣa, who is pure and infinite and in whom abound blissful perfections. (1)

परं ब्रह्मैवाज्ञं भ्रमपरिगतं संसरति तत्
परोपाध्यालीढं विवशमशुभस्यास्पदमिति ।
श्रुतिन्यायापेतं जगति विततं मोहनमिदम्
तमो येनापास्तं स हि विजयते यामुनमुनिः ॥ २ ॥

Gloriously triumphs the sage Yāmuna, who dispelled the delusive darkness filling the world in the shape of doctrines devoid of both scriptural authority and reason maintaining that (*a*) the highest Brahman itself is bereft of knowledge and is caught up in illusion and hence wanders in the realm of transmigration, (*b*) it is conditioned by an alien adjunct and is rendered helpless and that (*c*) it has become the seat of evil. (2)

१. अशेषजगद्धितानुशासनश्रुतिनिकरशिरसि समधिगतोऽयमर्थः । जीवपरयाथात्म्यज्ञानपूर्वकवर्णाश्रमधर्मेतिकर्तव्यताकपरमपुरुषचरणयुगलध्यानार्चनप्रणामादिः अत्यर्थप्रियः तत्प्राप्तिफलः ।

अस्य जीवात्मनोऽनाद्यविद्यासञ्चितपुण्यपापरूपकर्मप्रवाहहेतुकब्रह्मादिसुर-नर-तिर्यक्-स्थावरात्मक-चतुर्विधदेहप्रवेशकृत-तत्तदात्माभिमानजनिता-

वर्जनीयभवभयविध्वंसनाय, देहातिरिक्तात्मस्वरूप - तत्स्वभावतदन्तर्यामिपर-मात्मस्वरूप - तत्स्वभाव - तदुपासन - तत्फलभूतात्मस्वरूपाविर्भावपूर्वकानवधि-कातिशयानन्दब्रह्मानुभवज्ञापने प्रवृत्तं हि वेदान्तवाक्यजातम्—"तत्त्वमसि" "अयमात्मा ब्रह्म", "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरं य आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्माऽन्तर्याम्यमृतः", "एष सर्व-भूतान्तरात्माऽपहतपाप्मा दिव्यो देव एको नारायणः", "तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन", "ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्", "तमेवं विद्वानमृत इह भवति । नान्यः पन्था अयनाय विद्यते" इत्यादिकम् ।

**1.** The crown of Vedas *i.e.*, The Upaniṣads, which lays down the good of the whole world, enshrines this truth: A seeker, after first acquiring a true understanding of the individual self and the Supreme and equipped with the performance of the duties pertaining to his station in life, must devote himself to the meditation, worship and adoring salutation of the blessed feet of the supreme Person. This done with immeasurable joy leads to the attainment of the Supreme.

The individual self is subject to beginningless nescience, which has brought about an accumulation of karma, of the nature of both merit and demerit. The flood of such karma causes his entry into four kinds of bodies—heavenly, human, animal and plant beginning with that of Brahma downwards. This ingression into bodies produces the delution of identity with those respective bodies (and the consequent attachments and aversions). This delution inevitably brings about all the fears inherent in the state of worldly existence. The entire body of Vedānta aims at the annihilation of these fears. To accomplish their annihilation they teach the following: (1) The essential nature of the individual self as transcending the body. (2) The attributes of the individual self. (3) The essential nature of the Supreme that is the

inmost controller of both the material universe and the individual selves. (4) The attributes of the Supreme. (5) The devout meditation upon the Supreme. (6) The goal to which such meditation leads. The Vedanta aims at making known the goal attainable through such a life of meditation, the goal being the realization, of the real nature of the individual self and after and through that realization, the direct experience of Brahman, which is of the nature of bliss infinite and perfect. The passages to this effect may be illustrated by the following: 'That thou art (*Chā. VI, IX*, 4)'; 'This self is Brahman (*Bṛ. VI, IV*, 5)'; 'He who dwells in the self, who is in the self, whom the self does not know, whose body this self is, who rules this self from within, that one is your self, the inner Ruler, the Immortal. (*Bṛ. V, VII*)'; 'He is the inner self of all creatures, free from all imperfections, the divine, the sole God Nārāyaṇa (*Su. VII*)'; 'The Brāhmaṇas desire to know this one, through the study of the Vedas, through sacrifices, charity, austerities and fasting (*Bṛ. VI, IV*, 22)'; 'The knower of Brahman attains the Highest (*Tai. II*, 1)'; 'He who knows him thus attains immortality here. There is no other pathway to this goal (*Pu. VII*)'.

**२. जीवात्मस्वरूपं देवमनुष्यादिप्रकृतिपरिणामविशेषरूपनानाविधभेद-रहितं ज्ञानानन्दैकगुणम् । तस्यैतस्य कर्मकृतदेवादिभेदेऽपध्वस्ते स्वरूपभेदो वाचामगोचरः स्वसंवेद्यः "ज्ञानस्वरूपम्" इत्येतावदेव निर्देश्यम् । तच्च सर्वेषामात्मनां समानम् ।**

**एवंविधचिदचिदात्मकप्रपञ्चस्य उद्भवस्थितिप्रलयसंसारनिवर्तनैकहेतु-भूतः, समस्तहेयप्रत्यनीकतया अनन्तकल्याणैकताततया च स्वेतरसमस्तवस्तु-विलक्षणस्वरूपः, अनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणगणः, सर्वात्म-परब्रह्म-परज्योतिः-परतत्त्व-परमात्म-सदादिशब्दभेदैर्निखिलवेदान्तवेद्यो भगवन्नारा-यणः पुरुषोत्तम इत्यन्तर्यामिस्वरूपम् । तस्य च वैभवप्रतिपादनपराः श्रुतयः स्वेतरसमस्तचिदचिद्वस्तुजातान्तरात्मतया निखिलनियमनं, तच्छक्ति-तदंश-**

तद्विभूति - तद्रूप - तच्छरीर - तत्तनुप्रभृतिभिश्शब्दैः, तत्सामानाधिकरण्येन च प्रतिपादयन्ति ।

2. The essential nature of the individual self is devoid of the manifold distinctions pertaining to the various modifications of material nature constitutive of the bodies of the various kinds like heavenly and human. It has only knowledge and bliss as its attributes. When the bodily differentiations born of karma are destroyed, the essential individuality, indescribable but self-cognized, can only be represented as of the 'nature of consciousness (*Vi, I, IV*, 40)'. This essential nature is common to all individual selves.

This world, of the aforesaid nature, consisting of spiritual and physical entities, has the supreme Spirit, as the ground of its origination, maintenance, destruction and of the liberation of the individual from transmigratory existence. He, the supreme One, is unique, transcending in character every other entity, because his nature is opposed to all evil and is of the sole nature of supreme bliss. He is the abode of countless auspicious attributes unsurpassed in their perfection. He is Bhagavān Nārāyaṇa, the highest Spirit. He is presented by the entire Vedanta, through variations of terminology as the 'Soul of all', 'Highest Brahman', 'Highest Light', 'Highest Reality', 'Highest Self' and 'Being'. Such is the nature of the inner Controller. The Vedas devoted to the exposition of his glory, expound the fact that he controls all entities, sentient as well as non-sentient, as their indwelling self. (They do it in two ways): (1) They describe them as his 'power', 'part', 'splendour', 'form', 'body' and 'organism' and through such other terms. (2) They also affirm the oneness of these entities with him.

३. तस्य वैभवप्रतिपादनपराणामेषां सामानाधिकरण्यादीनां विवरणे प्रवृत्ताः केचन "निर्विशेषज्ञानमात्रमेव ब्रह्म; तच्च नित्यमुक्तस्वप्रकाशमपि

तत्त्वमस्यादिसामानाधिकरण्यावगतजीवैक्यम्; ब्रह्मैव अज्ञं, बध्यते, मुच्यते च; निर्विशेषचिन्मात्रातिरेकीशेशितव्याद्यनन्तविकल्पस्वरूपं कृत्स्नं जगत् मिथ्या; कश्चिद्बद्धः, कश्चिन्मुक्त इतीयं व्यवस्था न विद्यते; इतः पूर्वं केचन मुक्ता इत्ययमर्थो मिथ्या; एकमेव शरीरं जीववत्, निर्जीवानीतराणि शरीराणि; तच्च शरीरं किमिति न व्यवस्थितम्; आचार्यो ज्ञानस्योपदेष्टा मिथ्या, प्रमाता मिथ्या, शास्त्रं च मिथ्या, शास्त्रजन्यज्ञानं च मिथ्या; एतत्सर्वं मिथ्याभूतेनैव शास्त्रेणावगतम्" इति वर्णयन्ति ।

**3.** Some engaged in the explanation of these passages, like the proposition expressing identity, descriptive of the glory of Brahman put forth the following explanation: Undifferentiated Consciousness alone is Brahman. It is eternally free and self-luminous. Still its identity with the individual self is made known through propositions positing identity such as 'That thou art'. Brahman itself, being ignorant, gets bound and is (subsequently) released. Apart from the undifferentiated consciousness, the whole universe, consisting of endless plurality exhibiting differences like that between Īśvara and the creatures, is unreal. That there is some one who is liberated and some one that is bound is an arrangement that does not exist. That some have attained liberation before now is not true. One body alone is ensouled. The other bodies are soul-less. It is not determined which that body is. The teacher who imparts knowledge is just a phenomenal appearance. The knower (in all cognitions) is also a phenomenal appearance. The scripture is also unreal. The knowledge arising out of the scripture is also unreal. All this is known from the scripture itself which is unreal.

४. अपरे तु "अपहतपाप्मत्वादिसमस्तकल्याणगुणोपेतमपि ब्रह्म, तेनैव ऐक्यावबोधेन, केनचिदुपाधिविशेषेण सम्बद्धं, बध्यते मुच्यते च, नानाविध-मलरूपपरिणामास्पदं च" इति व्यवस्थिताः ।

**4.** Others hold thus: Brahman, though possessed of all auspicious attributes like freedom from sin, is subject to bondage and attains liberation and is the seat of many varieties of evil owing to its association with a particular limiting adjunct. This doctrine is necessitated by the passages affirming identity.

५. अन्ये पुनः, ऐक्यावबोधयाथात्म्यं वर्णयन्तः "स्वाभाविकनिरतिशयापरिमितोदारगुणसागरं ब्रह्मैव सुर - नर - तिर्यक् - स्थावर - नारकि-स्वर्ग्यपवर्गि - चेतनैकस्वभावं, स्वभावतो विलक्षणं चाविलक्षणं च वियदादिनानाविधपरिणामास्पदं च" इति प्रत्यवतिष्ठन्ते ।

**5.** Others again maintain, in explanation of the same principle of identity, the following view: Brahman, an ocean of great attributes, inherent and unlimited, acquires the characted of the individual selves of all kinds, the divine, the human, the animal and plant, those consigned to hell, those enjoying heaven and the liberated individuals. This Brahman is inherently differentiated from and not so differentiated from them. It is subject to various modifications thus evolving into entities like the (element) ether.

६. तत्र प्रथमपक्षे श्रुत्यर्थपर्यालोचनपराः दुष्परिहरान् दोषान् उदाहरन्ति । तथा हि—प्रकृतपरामर्शितच्छब्दावगतस्य ब्रह्मणः स्वसङ्कल्पकृतजगदुदयविभवविलयादयः "तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इत्यारभ्य "सन्मूलास्सोम्येमास्सर्वाः प्रजास्सदायतनास्सत्प्रतिष्ठाः" इत्यादिभिः पदैः प्रतिपादिताः, तत्सम्बधितया प्रकरणान्तरनिर्दिष्टाः सर्वज्ञता – सर्वशक्तित्व – सर्वेश्वरत्व – सर्वप्रकारत्व – समाभ्यधिकनिवृत्ति-सत्यकामत्व-सत्यसङ्कल्पत्व–सर्वावभासकत्वाद्यनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणगणाः, "अपहतपाप्मा" इत्याद्यनेकवाक्यावगतनिरस्तनिखिलदोषता च सर्वे तस्मिन् पक्षे विहन्यन्ते ।

**6.** Those given to a thorough reflection on the import of the Vedas point out fallacies in the first view, which can

in no way be obviated. The criticism can be elaborated as follows: The term 'that' (in 'That thou art') signifies Brahman, the subject-matter of the discourse. The statements like 'It thought, "Let me be many, let me grow forth into many" (*Chā. VI, II*, 3)', and 'All these creatures have Being as their source, they abide in Being and they are based on Being (*Chā. VI, VIII*, 6)' affirm that the origin, maintenance and disappearance of the world are the sport of Brahman, by whose will these processes are brought about. Other scriptural passages dealing with the same theme enunciate, as related to Brahman's authorship of these processes, countless auspicious attributes of surpassing perfection like omniscience, omnipotence, universal overlordship, the possession of all entities as its modes, the negation of the superiority and equality of everything else to it, and the power of realising all desires and will and the effulgence that illumines the whole universe. And several other passages like 'Free from sin (*Chā. VIII, VII*, 1)' etc., speak of Brahman as being free from all imperfections. Now all these characterizations of Brahman get negated on the first view.

**७. अथ स्यात् — उपक्रमेऽपि एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानमुखेन कारणस्यैव सत्यतां प्रतिज्ञाय, तस्य कारणभूतस्यैव सत्यतां, विकारभूतस्य च असत्यतां मृद्दृष्टान्तेन दर्शयित्वा, सत्यभूतस्यैव ब्रह्मणः "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्, एकमेवाद्वितीयम्" इति सजातीय-विजातीय-निखिलभेदनिरसनेन निर्विशेषतैव प्रतिपादिता । एतच्छोधकानि प्रकरणान्तरवाक्यान्यपि "सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म" "निष्कलं" "निष्क्रियं" "निर्गुणं" "निरञ्जनं" "विज्ञानम्" "आनन्दम्" इत्यादीनि सर्वविशेषप्रत्यनीकैकाकारतां बोधयन्ति । न च एकाकारबोधनेऽपि पदानां पर्यायता एकत्वेऽपि वस्तुनः सर्वप्रत्यनीकाकारत्वोप-स्थापनेन सर्वपदानामर्थवत्वात् इति ।**

**7.** The following defence may be put forward by the purva-pakṣin: In the section under consideration, in the

commencement itself, the sole reality of the cause is propounded through the declaration of that one knowledge from which all knowledge is said to follow. It is further shown that the cause alone is real and that all its modifications are unreal, through the illustrations of clay and its products. It is then asserted of that Brahman, the real, that it is undifferentiated, as it is without any other entity either generically the same or different. The idea is embodied in the statement, 'Being alone was this in the beginning, one only, without a second (*Chā. VI, II,* 1)'. Passages, found in other parts of the scripture, which determine the exact nature of Brahman affirm that 'Brahman is real, knowledge and infinite (*Tai. II,* 1)' and that it is 'without parts', 'actionless', 'flawless', 'attributeless', 'consciousness', 'bliss', etc., and thus teach that the sole nature of Brahman is to be contrary to all differentiating determinations. The terms signifying the unitary essence are not tautologous on that account. Even though the entity is absolutely one, the several terms serve to demarcate it as opposed to all pluralizing characterizations. Thus all terms have significance.

८. नैतदेवं, एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञानं, सर्वस्य मिथ्यात्वे सर्वस्य ज्ञातव्यस्याभावात् न सेत्स्यति; सत्यमिथ्यात्वयोः एकताप्रसक्तिर्वा; अपि तु एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञा सर्वस्य तदात्मकत्वेनैव सत्यत्वे सिध्यति ।

अयमर्थः श्वेतकेतुं प्रत्याह "स्तब्धोऽसि, उत तमादेशमप्राक्ष्यः......" इति; परिपूर्ण इव लक्ष्यसे, तानाचार्यान्प्रति तमप्यादेशं पृष्टवानसि इति । आदिश्यते अनेनेत्यादेशः । आदेशः प्रशासनम्; "एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः" इत्यादिभिरैकार्थ्यात् । तथा च मानवं वचः "प्रशासितारं सर्वेषाम्" इत्यादि । अत्रापि 'एकमेव' इति जगदुपादानतां प्रतिपाद्य, 'अद्वितीय'-पदेन अधिष्ठात्रन्तरनिवारणात् अस्यैव अधिष्ठातृत्वमपि प्रतिपाद्यते । अतः तं प्रशासितारं जगदुपादानभूतमपि पृष्टवानसि ?

येन श्रुतेन मतेन विज्ञातेन, अश्रुतममतमविज्ञातं, श्रुतं मतं विज्ञातं भवति इत्युक्तं स्यात् ।

8. We reply that this interpretation is inadmissible. The knowledge of the one cannot lead to the knowledge of all, on this interpretation, as all the entities to be known, being unreal, simply do not exist or the identity of the real and the unreal will follow by implication. On the contrary, if all the entities are real only by virtue of being included in the one (or being embodiments of the one) the knowledge of the 'one' will lead to the knowledge of all.

To discuss the whole section—the question that Uddālaka puts to Śvetaketu is this: 'You are arrogant. Did you inquire into that law? (*Chā. VI, I,* 3)'. The question means, 'You dissemble perfection. Did you seek to learn from those teachers concerning that law also?' The term 'law' signifies here him by whom the law is ordained. Law literally means 'command'. In that case the conception here would cohere with the passage, 'Owing to the command of the Imperishable, the sun and the moon stand apart sustained (*Bṛ. V, VIII,* 9)'. So runs the words of Manu (*XII,* 122) also when he says, 'The one who commands all' etc. Even this section itself propounds first the idea that Brahman is the material cause of the universe by the phrase 'one only' and then excludes another efficient cause by the expression 'without a second'. Therefore the whole question may be interpreted thus: Have you enquired into that principle which is the commanding spirit as well as the material cause of the world, by hearing of which, by thinking of which and by understanding which, everything that was not heard of before, not thought of before and not understood before, comes to be heard of, thought of and understood?

९. निखिलजगदुदयविभवविलयादिकारणभूतं सर्वज्ञत्व - सत्यकामत्व - सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वाद्यपरिमितोदारगुणसागरं किं ब्रह्म त्वया श्रुतम् इति हार्दो

भाव: । तस्य निखिलकारणतया कारणमेव नानासंस्थानविशेषसंस्थितं कार्यमित्युच्यत इति कारणभूतसूक्ष्मचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकब्रह्मविज्ञानेन कार्यभूतमखिलं जगत् विज्ञातं भवतीति हृदि निधाय "येन अश्रुतं श्रुतं भवति, अमतं मतम्, अविज्ञातं विज्ञातं" स्यात् इति पुत्रं प्रति पृष्टवान् पिता । तदेतत् सकलस्य वस्तुजातस्य एककारणत्वं पितृहृदि निहितमजानन् पुत्रः परस्परविलक्षणेषु वस्तुषु अन्यस्य ज्ञानेन तदन्यज्ञानस्याघटमानतां बुध्वा परिचोदयति "कथन्नु भगवस्स आदेश" इति । परिचोदितः पुनः तदेव हृदि निहितं ज्ञानानन्दामलत्वैकस्वरूपं, अपरिच्छेद्यमाहात्म्यं, सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वमिश्रैरनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणगणैर्जुष्टम्, अविकारस्वरूपं परं ब्रह्मैव, नामरूपविभागानर्हसूक्ष्मचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरं स्वलीलार्थं स्वसङ्कल्पेन, अनन्तविचित्रस्थिरत्रसरूपजगत्संस्थानं स्वांशेनावस्थितमिति, तज्ज्ञानेन अन्यस्य निखिलस्य ज्ञाततां ब्रुवन्, लोकदृष्टं कार्यकारणयोरनन्यत्वं दर्शयितुं दृष्टान्तमाह "यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृण्मयं विज्ञातं स्यात् वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्" इति । एकमेव मृद्द्रव्यं, स्वैकदेशेन, नानाव्यवहारास्पदत्वाय, घटशरावादिनानासंस्थानाऽवस्थारूपविकारापन्ननानानामधेयमपि, मृत्तिकासंस्थान विशेषत्वात् मृद्द्रव्यमेवेत्थमवस्थितं, न वस्त्वन्तरम् इति; यथा मृत्पिण्डविज्ञानेन तत्संस्थाविशेषघटशरावादिरूपं सर्वं विज्ञातमेव भवतीत्यर्थः ।

ततः कृत्स्नस्य जगतो ब्रह्मैककारणतामजानन् पुत्रः पृच्छति "भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्ब्रवीतु" इति । ततः सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति ब्रह्मैव सर्वकारणम् इत्युपदिशन् स होवाच "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्" इति ।

**9.** The inner idea is this: Have you learnt about Brahman which is the primeval cause of the processes like creation, maintenance and destruction of the entire universe and which is the ocean of limitless perfections like omniscience and realized desires and will that gets realized? The father keeping in his mind the thought that cause itself assuming manifold configurations comes to be known as the effect and that Brahman being the sole cause of all, the knowledge of Brahman in its causal aspect possessing as its body the

sentient and non-sentient entities in their subtle unmanifest condition, includes the knowledge of the universe in the state of the effect, asks the son about that 'Whereby the unheard of becomes heard of, the unthought of becomes thought of, and the ununderstood becomes understood? (*Chā. VI, I*, 3)'. The son not intuiting the idea at the back of his father's mind that all that exists proceeds from a single cause thinks that among different existences, the knowledge of one existence cannot lead to the knowledge of another existence. Hence he inquires, 'How can there be such a law, Sir? (*Chā. VI, I*, 3)'. Questioned thus the father proceeds to demonstrate the priliminary principle of the identity of cause and effect, a matter of common experience. While he does so his purpose is to expound ultimately his inner idea, operative in his discourse from the very beginning. That idea may be set forth as follows: The highest Brahman is purity, bliss and knowledge in substance. Its grandeur is inconceivable. It is resplendent with countless auspicious attributes, like the will that irresistably realizes itself, in surpassing perfection. It is immutable in nature. Still, out of its causal state, in which the sentient and non-sentient beings from its body in their subtle condition, undifferentiated in name and form, it, through its own will, passes in sheer sport into the state of the effect, by one of its aspects, and comes to possess the limitless and diversified world of moving and non-moving beings as its own configuration. With this idea in his mind he proceeds to propound how knowledge of Brahman leads to knowledge of all. As a preliminary step in exposition, he demonstrates the identity of cause and effect, a principle quite obvious to common experience. For that purpose he has taken this instance, 'Even as, by knowing the lump of clay, all that is made of clay is known and "by speech, the modification and name are brought about and only as clay is it real" (*Chā. VI, I*, 4)'. The meaning is this: The same substance,

clay, in a part of itself, becomes modified into a multitude of forms and conditions and acquires a multitude of names for serving different practical purposes. Even then these different products, being nothing other than particular forms of clay, the original substance, clay itself exists in these several conditions. The products are not entities other than clay. Then it is pointed out that by knowing the lump of clay, all its varied configurations like pots and pans are known. Then the son, not knowing that Brahman alone is the cause of the entire cosmos, asks, 'May your blessed self, instruct me about that matter (*Chā. VI, I,* 7)'. Then the father instructing that the omniscient and omnipotent Brahman is the cause of all, lays down, 'Being alone, this was in the beginning, one only, without a second (*Chā. VI, II,* 1)'.

१०. अत्र इदम् इति जगन्निर्दिष्टम्; अग्र इति च सृष्टेः पूर्वकालः। तस्मिन् काले जगतः सदात्मकतां "सदेव" इति प्रतिपाद्य, तत् सृष्टिकालेऽप्यविशिष्टम् इति कृत्वा, "एकमेव" इति, सदापन्नस्य जगतः तदानीमविभक्तनामरूपतां प्रतिपाद्य, तत्प्रतिपादनेनैव सतो जगदुपादनत्वं प्रतिपादितमिति स्वव्यतिरिक्तनिमित्तकारणम् "अद्वितीय"-पदेन प्रतिषिद्धम् इति, "तमादेशमप्राक्ष्यो येनाऽश्रुतं श्रुतं भवति" इति आदावेव प्रशासितैव जगदुपादानमिति हृदि निहितम् इदानीमभिव्यक्तम्। एतदेवोपपादयति—स्वयमेव जगदुपादनं जगन्निमित्तं च सत् "तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति। तदेतत्सच्छब्दवाच्यं परं ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति सत्यसङ्कल्पम् अवाप्तसमस्तकाममपि लीलार्थं विचित्रानन्तचिदचिन्मिश्रजगद्रूपेण अहमेव "बहु स्यां" तदर्थं "प्रजायेय" इति स्वयमेव सङ्कल्प्य, स्वांशैकदेशादेव वियदादिभूतानि सृष्ट्वा, पुनरपि सैव सच्छब्दाभिहिता परा देवता एवम् ऐक्षत, "हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवताः अनेन जीवेनात्मनाऽनुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि" इति। "अनेन जीवेनात्मना" इति जीवस्य ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं प्रतिपाद्य, ब्रह्मात्मकजीवानुप्रवेशादेव कृत्स्नस्याचिद्वस्तुनः पदार्थत्वम्, एवम्भूतस्यैव अचिद्वस्तुनो नामरूपभाक्त्वम् इति च दर्शयति।

**10.** In this proposition the term 'this' signifies the world. The expression 'in the beginning' signifies the time prior to creation. At that time the world was one with Being. But the world is one with being even after creation. Therefore it is pointed out that the world was one with Being then in the sense that it was without distinctions of names and forms. This is signified by the expression 'one only'. The fact that Being is the material cause of the world is thereby enunciated. Then the possibility of another entity being the intelligent operative cause is repudiated by the term 'advitīya' meaning 'one without a second'. By these elaborations is the idea now revealed, which was in the heart of the teacher from the beginning as cryptically indicated in the opening statement, 'Did you learn that law, by which, that which is not heard of, becomes heard of' etc.—the idea of the great law-giver being the material cause of the world. This idea is further explained. The Being itself, the material and efficient cause of the world, thought, 'Let me be many, let me multiply (*Chā. VI, II*, 3)'. The entity described as Being is the highest Brahman, all-knowing, all-powerful and has its will realizing itself unfailingly. Though all its desires are eternally realized, it willed, for purposes of sport, 'Let me be many', assuming the form of the world, consisting of the wondrously varied and limitless entities both sentient and non-sentient. For that purpose it thought, 'Let me multiply'; out of a part of itself it created the elements like ether. Then that highest Deity named Being deliberated thus, 'I will enter these three deities as ātman, the jīva and differentiate names and forms (*Chā. VI, III*, 2)'. Here the expressions 'ātman, the jīva' bring out the idea that the jīva or individual self has Brahman as its soul. Thus it is brought out explicitly that all that is non-sentient attains the status of an entity because of the entry into it of the individual self having Brahman as its inner ātman and that only as such do the non-sentient entities acquire names and forms.

११. एतदुक्तं भवति —जीवात्मा तु ब्रह्मणः शरीरतया प्रकारत्वात् ब्रह्मात्मकः "यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् । एवम्भूतस्य जीवस्य शरीरतया प्रकारभूतानि देवमनुष्यादिसंस्थानानि वस्तूनि इति ब्रह्मात्मकानि तानि सर्वाणि; अतः देवो मनुष्यः यक्षो राक्षसः पशुः मृगः पक्षी वृक्षो लता काष्ठं शिला तृणं घटः पटः इत्यादयस्सर्वे प्रकृतिप्रत्यययोगेन अभिधायकतया प्रसिद्धाः शब्दाः लोके तत्तद्वाच्यतया प्रतीयमानतत्तत्संस्थानवस्तुमुखेन तदभिमानिजीव-तदन्तर्यामिपरमात्मपर्यन्तसङ्घातस्यैव वाचकाः इति ।

**11.** The matter stands this way: The individual self constitutes a mode of Brahman being its body. Hence it is ensouled by Brahman. The fact that the individual is the body of Brahman is set forth in another passage of the Veda, 'Whose body the ātman is (*Su.* 6)'. The physical forms like the heavenly and human bodies, are the modes of individual souls being bodies. Therefore all these forms have Brahman as their ultimate self. Therefore all terms like gods, men, yakṣa, demon, beast, bird, tree, creeper, wood, stone, grass, jar and cloth, which have denotative power, formed of roots and suffixes, signify the objects which they name in ordinary parlance and through them they signify the individual selves embodied in them and through this second signification, their significance develops further till it culminates in Brahman, the highest Self dwelling as the inner controller of all individual selves. Thus all terms are denotative of this totality.

१२. एवं समस्तस्य चिदचिदात्मकप्रपञ्चस्य सदुपादानता-सन्निमित्तता-सदाधारता-सन्नियाम्यता-सच्छेषतादि सर्वं च "सन्मूलाः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठाः" इत्यादिना विस्तरेण प्रतिपाद्य, कार्यकारणभावादिमुखेन "ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं, तत्सत्यम्" इति कृत्स्नस्य जगतः ब्रह्मात्मकत्वमेव "सत्यम्" इति प्रतिपाद्य, कृत्स्नस्य जगतः स एवात्मा, कृत्स्नं च जगत् तस्य शरीरम् । तस्मात् "त्वं"-शब्दवाच्यमपि जीवप्रकारं

ब्रह्मैव इति सर्वस्य ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं प्रतिज्ञातं, "तत्त्वमसि" इति जीवविशेषे उपसंहृतम् ।

**12.** Thus, the section of the Upaniṣad under consideration develops in details the thought that the entire universe of sentient and non-sentient entities has Being as its material cause, its efficient cause, its ground, its controller and its Lord to which it is instrumental in value. This is done in the passage commencing with the text, 'All these creatures have Being as their source, abide in Being and are based on Being (*Chā. VI, VIII*, 4–6)'. Secondly it proceeds through the principle of causality to the thought that the only truth about the universe is that it is animated by Brahman: 'All this is ensouled by this (Being). That is the truth (*Chā. VI, VIII*, 6)'. He is the self of the whole world and the whole world constitutes his body. Hence the section proceeds to the thought that the entity signified by the term 'thou' is Brahman itself having the individual self as its mode. The universal principle originally enunciated that all entities are ensouled by Brahman is applied to a particular self (Śvetaketu) and the particular conclusion is drawn therefrom.

१३. एतदुक्तं भवति—"ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्" इति, चेतनाचेतनप्रपञ्चम् "इदं सर्वम्" इति निर्दिश्य, तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य एषः आत्मा इति प्रतिपादितः । प्रपञ्चोद्देशेन ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं प्रतिपादितमित्यर्थः । तदिदं ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं, किम् आत्मशरीरभावेन उत स्वरूपेण इति विवेचनीयम् । स्वरूपेणेति चेत्, ब्रह्मणः सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वादयः "तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इत्युपक्रमावगताः बाधिता भवन्ति । शरीरात्मभावेन च तदात्मकत्वं श्रुत्यन्तराद्विशेषतोऽवगतम्, "अन्तःप्रविष्टश्शास्ता जनानां सर्वात्मा" इति । प्रशासितृत्वरूपात्मत्वेन सर्वेषां जनानाम् "अन्तः प्रविष्टः", अतः "सर्वात्मा", सर्वेषां जनानाम् आत्मा, सर्वं चास्य शरीरम् इति विशेषतो ज्ञायते ब्रह्मात्मकत्वम्; "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन् आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति, स ते आत्माऽन्तर्या-

म्यमृतः" इति च । अत्रापि "अनेन जीवेनात्मना" इति इदमेव ज्ञायत इति पूर्वमेवोक्तम् । अतः सर्वस्य चिदचिद्वस्तुनो ब्रह्मशरीरत्वात् सर्वशरीरं सर्वप्रकारं सर्वैश्शब्दैः ब्रह्मैवाभिधीयत इति; "तत् त्वम्" इति सामानाधिकरण्येन जीवशरीरतया जीवप्रकारं ब्रह्मैवाभिहितम् ।

**13.** The crux of the matter is this: 'All this is ensouled by *this*'. By the term, 'All this' the world of finite spirits and matter is signified and the fact of the world being ensouled by this ātman is affirmed. The character of having Brahman as the inner soul is predicated of the subject, namely, the world. Now this fact of Brahman being the soul of the world must be exactly elucidated. There are two alternatives: Does it mean that Brahman is the self of the world in terms of the relation of soul and body? Or is the world, identical in substance with Brahman? If the alternative that the world is identical with Brahman in substance is admitted, the attributes of Brahman, like the will that realizes itself unfailingly, asserted in the opening section itself, 'It thought, "Let me be many" (*Chā. VI, II,* 3)' get nullified. The second alternative of immanence as soul in the body, is specially made out in other passages of the scripture, 'He has entered into all creatures, he is the ruler of all creatures and he is the self of all (*Ā. III,* 24)'. It means: He has entered into all creatures as their soul, being their ruler; therefore he is the self of all creatures and all creatures constitute his body. Thus Brahman being the self of all is definitely explained. There is another passage also to the same effect: 'He who dwells in the ātman, who is in the ātman, whom ātman does not know, whose body the ātman is, who rules the ātman, know him, as your ātman, the inner ruler, immortal (*Bṛ. Ma. V, VII,* 22)'. Even in this very section, 'The ātman, the jīva (*Chā. VI, III,* 2)' the same idea is eluci dated as set forth before. Therefore all the sentient beings and non-sentient objects being the body of Brahman, Brahman

having all entities as its body, as its modes, is itself the subject denoted by all terms. Hence in the proposition embodying co-ordinate predication asserting indentity between 'That' and 'Thou', Brahman itself, with the jīva as its mode, having the jīva as its body, is spoken of.

१४. एवमभिहिते सति अयमर्थो ज्ञायते—"त्वम्" इति यः पूर्वं देहस्याधिष्ठातृतया प्रतीतिः, सः परमात्मशरीरतया परमात्मप्रकारभूतः परमात्मपर्यन्तः; अतः "त्वम्" इति शब्दः तत्प्रकारविशिष्टं तदन्तर्यामिणमेवाचष्टे इति; "अनेन जीवेनात्मनाऽनुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि" इति ब्रह्मात्मकतयैव जीवस्य शरीरिणः स्वनामभाक्त्वात् । "तत् त्वम्" इति समानाधिकरणप्रवृत्तयोर्द्वयोरपि पदयोः ब्रह्मैव वाच्यम् । तत्र 'तत्'-पदं जगत्कारणभूतं सर्वकल्याणगुणाकरं निरवद्यं निर्विकारमाचष्टे । 'त्वम्' इति च, तदेव ब्रह्म, जीवान्तर्यामिरूपं सशरीरजीवप्रकारविशिष्टमाचष्टे । तदेवं प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तभेदेन एकस्मिन् ब्रह्मण्येव 'तत् त्वम्' इति द्वयोः पदयोर्वृत्तिरुक्ता । ब्रह्मणो निरवद्यत्वं निर्विकारत्वं सर्वकल्याणगुणाकरत्वं जगत्कारणत्वं च अबाधितम् ।

**14.** The meaning implied in such a manner of speaking is this: He, the individual self, who was cognized previously as the controlling principle in the body, is just constitutive of the body of the highest Self and so is his mode. His existence reaches up to the highest Self. Therefore the term 'Thou' denotes the inner ruler qualified by the individual self as his mode. The Vedānta text, 'As this ātman, the jīva, entering, I will differentiate names and forms (*Chā. VI, III*, 2)', makes it clear that the individual self embodied as he is, can have his individual name only by virtue of Brahman being his indwelling soul. Hence both the terms 'That' and 'Thou' put in apposition signify only Brahman. The term 'That' refers to Brahman, the cause of the world, the abode of all perfections, the faultless and the immutable. The term 'Thou'

refers to the same Brahman, the inner ruler in all individual selves, qualified by the jīva along with its body as its mode. Thus the two have different connotations and denote the same Brahman. The perfection, immutability, possession of all auspicious attributes and the causality in relation to the world are not denied of Brahman.

१५. अश्रुतवेदान्ताः पुरुषाः "सर्वे पदार्थाः सर्वे जीवात्मानश्च ब्रह्मात्मकाः" इति न पश्यन्ति । सर्वशब्दानां च केवलेषु तत्तत्पदार्थेषु वाच्यैकदेशेषु वाच्यपर्यवसानं मन्यन्ते । इदानीं वेदान्तवाक्यश्रवणेन ब्रह्म-कार्यतया तदन्तर्यामिकतया च सर्वस्य ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं सर्वशब्दानां तत्तत्प्रकार-संस्थितब्रह्मवाचित्वं च जानन्ति ।

**15.** Men, unacquainted with Vedānta, do not see that all things and all individual selves have Brahman as their self. They think that all terms exhaust their significance by signifying the various objects by themselves, which objects are in reality a part and not the whole of the meaning of terms. Now by the study of Vedānta, they understand that all such objects are the effects of Brahman, that Brahman is the inner ruler of them all and that they are animated by Brahman as their very soul. Therefore they come to understand that all terms signify Brahman itself having as its modes the entities, to which latter alone the terms are applied in common usage.

१६. नन्वेवं गवादिशब्दानां तत्तत्पदार्थवाचितया व्युत्पत्तिर्बाधिता स्यात् । नैवम्; सर्वे शब्दाः अचिज्जीवविशिष्टपरमात्मनो वाचकाः इत्युक्तं "नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि" इत्यत्र । तत्र लौकिकास्तु पुरुषाः शब्दं व्यवहरन्तः, शब्दवाच्ये प्रधानांशस्य परमात्मनः प्रत्यक्षाद्यपरिच्छेद्यत्वात् वाच्यैकदेशभूते वाच्यसमाप्तिं मन्यन्ते । वेदान्तश्रवणेन हि व्युत्पत्तिः पूर्यते ।

**16.** 'In that case', it may be objected, 'the significance of term like cow in relation to what they noımally denote in

standard usage will stand negated'. Our reply is that no such results follows. All terms are denotative of the highest Self, which is qualified by inanimate nature and individual selves. This is what is urged in the text, 'I will differentiate names and forms (*Chā. VI, III,* 2)'. In this matter ordinary people, while putting language to use, imagine that the denotation of terms is exhausted by their reference to the various empirical objects they signify. But this is just a part of the range of the denotation that really belongs to terms. This restriction of the denotative significance is due to the fact that the principal part of the objective meaning of the term, namely the highest Self, transcends ordinary modes of cognition like perception. The study of Vedānta completes the understanding of the significance of terms (and does not cancel that significance as alleged).

१७. एवमेव वैदिकाश्शब्दास्सर्वे परमात्मपर्यन्तान् स्वार्थान् बोधयन्ति । वैदिका एव सर्वे शब्दाः, आदौ वेदादेवोद्धृत्योद्धृत्य, परेणैव ब्रह्मणा सर्वपदार्थान् पूर्ववत् सृष्ट्वा, तेषु परमात्मपर्यन्तेषु पूर्ववत् नामतया प्रयुक्ताः ।

तदाह मनुः—

सर्वेषां तु स नामानि कर्माणि च पृथक् पृथक् ।
वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ पृथक्संस्थाश्च निर्ममे ॥ इति ॥

"संस्थाः" संस्थानानि, रूपाणीति यावत् । आह च भगवान् पराशरः—

नामरूपं च भूतानां कृत्यानां च प्रपञ्चनम् ।
वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ देवादीनां चकार सः ॥ इति ॥

श्रुतिश्च "सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत्" इति । सूर्यादीन् पूर्ववत् परिकल्प्य, नामानि च पूर्ववच्चकारेत्यर्थः ।

**17.** Thus all Vedic terms denote their respective referents in such a way that the denotation stretches up to the highest Self. The highest Brahman brought forth the various beings of the world as before and took out the terms of the Vedas

and applied them as before as names to those beings, which have their being in Brahman. Manu says, 'In the beginning He created the names of all actions and the different configurations even according to the words of the veda (*I*, 21)'. Configuration (saṁsthāna) means form. Bhagavān Parāśara says, 'In the beginning he set forth names, forms and duties of beings like the gods through the words of the Vedas themselves (*Vi. I, V*, 63)'. The Vedas also declare, 'The Creator fashioned the sun and the moon as before'. It means that he fashioned entities like the sun as before and determined their names as before.

१८. एवं जगद्ब्रह्मणोरनन्यत्वं प्रपञ्चितम् । तेन एकेन ज्ञानेन सर्वस्य ज्ञातता उपपादिता भवति । सर्वस्य ब्रह्मकार्यताप्रतिपादनेन तदात्मकतयैव सत्यत्वं नान्यथेति "तत्सत्यम्" इत्युक्तम् । यथा दृष्टान्ते सर्वस्य मृद्विकारस्य मृदात्मनैव सत्यत्वम् ।

**18.** Thus the identity between the world and Brahman is explained. On this ground that all is known when the 'one' is known is accounted for. Since all entities are real only as the effects of Brahman and as ensouled by Brahman, it has been said, 'That is true'. In no other ways are they real. Just as, in the illustration of clay and its products, the products are real only as of the nature of clay, even so the world is real only as sustained by the indwelling Brahman.

१९. शोधकवाक्यान्यपि निरवद्यं सर्वकल्याणगुणाकरं ब्रह्म शोधयन्ति । सर्वप्रत्यनीकाकारताबोधनेऽपि, तत्तत्प्रत्यनीकाकारतायां भेदस्यावर्जनीयत्वान्न निर्विशेषत्वसिद्धिः ।

**19.** The propositions determinative of the nature of Brahman, determine it as being devoid of imperfections and as full of auspicious attributes. Even if they are interpreted as determining Brahman through the negation of all else, that very negation must be based on positive grounds in the nature of Brahman. As these positive grounds of negation

must characterize Brahman, it is impossible to uphold that Brahman is without differentiating characteristics.

२०. ननु ज्ञानमात्रं ब्रह्मेति प्रतिपादिते निर्विशेषज्ञानमात्रं ब्रह्मेति निश्चीयते । नैवम्; स्वरूपनिरूपणधर्मशब्दा हि धर्ममुखेन स्वरूपमपि प्रतिपादयन्ति गवादिशब्दवत् । तथाऽऽह सूत्रकार: "तद्गुणसारत्वात्तु तद्व्यपदेश: प्राज्ञवत्", "यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोष:" इति । ज्ञानेन धर्मेण स्वरूपमपि निरूपितं, न तु ज्ञानमात्रं ब्रह्मेति । कथमिदमवगम्यत इति चेत् "यस्सर्वज्ञस्सर्ववित्" इति ज्ञातृत्वश्रुते:, "परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते, स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च", "विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात्" इत्यादिश्रुतिशतसमधिगतमिदम् । ज्ञानस्य धर्ममात्रत्वात् धर्ममात्रस्यैकस्य वस्तुत्वप्रतिपादनानुपपत्तेश्च । अत: सत्यज्ञानादिपदानि स्वार्थभूतज्ञानादिविशिष्टमेव ब्रह्म प्रतिपादयन्ति ।

**20.** 'But', it may be said, 'as it is laid down that Brahman is pure knowledge, we must admit that it is undifferentiated knowledge'. We reply that such a conclusion does not follow. Terms signifying attributes definitive of the substantative nature of an entity denote the substantive nature also through the connotation of such definitive attributes. This is so in the analogous cases of terms like 'cow'. The author of the *Sūtras* (*II, III*, 29–30) holds, 'As it is the essential attribute, the substance itself is designated thus, as in the case of the omniscient one', and 'There is no flaw in this procedure, as the attribute is co-terminous with the substance'. Through the attribute of knowledge, the substantive nature is also determined and mere knowledge is not Brahman. 'How is this construed?' it may be asked. It is so construed because there is the passage, 'He who is all-knower and all-cognizer (*Mu. II, II*, 7)' making out that Brahman is a knower. There are hundreds of passages holding this position like the following: 'Transcendent and manifold power of his is sung in the scripture and also his inherent knowledge, strength

and activity (*Śve. VI, VI*, 17)' and 'By what means can you know the knower? (*Bṛ, IV, IV*, 14)'. Further, knowledge is only an attribute and an attribute merely by itself cannot constitute an entity. Therefore, the terms like, 'Real, Knowledge' denote Brahman as characterized by the attributes they connote.

२१. "तत् त्वम्" इति द्वयोरपि पदयोः स्वार्थप्रहाणेन निर्विशेषवस्तुस्वरूपोपस्थापनपरत्वे मुख्यार्थपरित्यागश्च ।

**21.** In the case of the terms 'That and 'Thou" to hold that both terms signify the undifferentiated substratum through the elimination of the distinctive connotations of 'That' and 'Thou' is to reject their principal significance.

२२. ननु ऐक्यतात्पर्यनिश्चयात् न लक्षणदोषः, "सोऽयं देवदत्तः" इतिवत् । यथा 'सोऽयम्' इत्यत्र 'स' इति शब्देन देशान्तरकालान्तरसम्बन्धी पुरुषः प्रतीयते; 'अयम्' इति च सन्निहितदेशवर्तमानकालसम्बन्धी । तयोस्सामानाधिकारण्येनैक्यं प्रतीयते । तत्र एकस्य युगपत् विरुद्धदेशकालसम्बन्धितया प्रतीतिर्न घटत इति, द्वयोरपि पदयोः स्वरूपमात्रोपस्थापनपरत्वं, स्वरूपस्य चैक्यं प्रतिपाद्यते इति चेत् ।

**22. (Objection):** Since unity of import is assured, there is no error in resorting to secondary meaning. Such is the case in the proposition, 'This is he, that Devadatta'. Here by the word 'He' a person associated with a different time and place is meant. By the word 'This' a person associated with the present time and the immediate vicinity of the speaker is meant. The identity of the two persons is conveyed by the proposition of co-ordinate predication. Since the same person cannot be conceived simultaneously as being present in two contradictory points of space and time, both the terms signify only the substantive personality of the man and the sameness of the person is brought out.

२३. नैतदेवम् — "सोऽयं देवदत्तः" इत्यत्रापि लक्षणगन्धो न विद्यते, विरोधाभावात् । एकस्य भूतवर्तमानक्रियाद्वयसम्बन्धो न विरुद्धः; देशान्तरस्थितिः भूता; सन्निहितदेशस्थितिः वर्तते; अतः भूतवर्तमानक्रियाद्वयसम्बन्धितया ऐक्यप्रतिपादनमविरुद्धम् । देशद्वयविरोधश्च कालभेदेन परिहृतः । लक्षणायामपि न द्वयोरपि पदयोर्लक्षणासमाश्रयणम्, एकेनैव लक्षितेन विरोधपरिहारात् । लक्षणाभाव एव उक्तः, देशान्तरसम्बन्धितया भूतस्यैव अन्यदेशसम्बन्धितया वर्तमानत्वाविरोधात् ।

**23. (Reply):** This account of the situation is wrong. There is not even the slightest recourse to secondary meaning in the case of the proposition, 'This is he, that Devadatta'. This is due to the fact that there is no contradiction in the primary meaning. The same individual can, without any contradiction, be associated with actions in the past and the present. Presence at a different place is an event of the past. Presence in the immediate vicinity is an event of the present. Therefore there is no contradiction involved in positing the identity of the individual associated with activities of the past and present. The association with two different locations in space is free from contradiction on account of the difference in the time of such association. Even if the secondary meaning is adopted, both the terms should not be understood in that implied manner, because adoption of secondary meaning for one of the terms would resolve the contradiction. And we have urged that there is no secondary meaning whatever in the instance under discussion. The absence of the secondary meaning follows from the fact that no contradiction is involved in the association of an entity with a different point in space at a past instant and its association with another point at the present instant.

२४. एवमत्रापि जगत्कारणभूतस्यैव ब्रह्मणः जीवान्तर्यामितया जीवात्मत्वमविरुद्धमिति प्रतिपादितम् । यथाभूतयोरेव हि द्वयोरैक्यं सामानाधि-

करण्येन प्रतीयते । तत्परित्यागेन स्वरूपमात्रैक्यं न सामानाधिकरण्यस्यार्थः । "भिन्नप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तानां शब्दानां एकस्मिन्नर्थे वृत्तिस्सामानाधिकरण्यम्" इति हि तद्विदः । तथाभूतयोरेव ऐक्यमुपपादितमस्माभिः ।

**24.** Thus even here, in the case of the aphorism, 'That thou art', Brahman the cause of the universe, being the self of the jīva, as its inner ruler, involves no contradiction whatever. It is such unification of the import of terms in their natural significance that is brought out in co-ordinate predication (sāmānādhikaraṇya). The reference to the identity of the pure substratum, through the rejection of the natural significance of the co-ordinate terms, is not the meaning of co-ordinate predication. The experts on such matters define it thus: 'The signification of an identical entity by several terms which are applied to that entity on different grounds is co-ordinate predication'. Our explanation of this instance entirely fulfils that principle. The identical import of terms taken in their natural signification is brought out by us.

२५. उपक्रमविरोध्युपसंहारवाक्यतात्पर्यनिश्चयश्च न घटते । उपक्रमे हि "तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इत्यादिना सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वं जगदेककारणत्वमप्युक्तम् । तद्विरोधि च अविद्याश्रयत्वादि ब्रह्मणः ।

**25.** Moreover, it is incorrect to construe the concluding proposition in a way that would stultify the initial declaration. The initial declaration is, 'It thought "Let me be many" (*Chā. VI, II*, 3)' etc. It affirms that Brahman's will is unfailingly realized and that it is the sole cause of the world. The opposite view will make Brahman the locus of nescience etc., and such imperfections as liability to nescience would flagrantly contradict the initial assertion of perfections.

२६. अपि च अर्थभेदतत्संसर्गविशेषबोधनकृतपदवाक्यस्वरूपतालब्धप्रमाणभावस्यत्शब्दस्य निर्विशेषवस्तुबोधनासामर्थ्यान्न निर्विशेषवस्तुनि शब्दः

माणम् । "निर्विशेष" इत्यादिशब्दास्तु केनचिद्विशेषेण विशिष्टतयाऽवगतस्य वस्तुनो वस्त्वन्तरावगतविशेषनिषेधपरतया बोधकाः इतरथा तेषामप्यनवबोधकत्वमेव; प्रकृतिप्रत्ययरूपेण पदस्यैव अनेकविशेषगर्भितत्वात् अनेकपदार्थसंसर्गबोधकत्वाच्च वाक्यस्य ।

**26.** Further, to proceed to a more general consideration, verbal testimony owes its authoritativeness to being made up of words and sentences corresponding to various referents of the words and their specific inter-relations. Hence verbal testimony of this nature can never communicate knowledge of an undifferentiated entity. Therefore verbal testimony cannot furnish the proof for such an entity. Even terms like 'undifferentiated' deny of the subject of discourse characteristics belonging to other entities and the subject would then be conceived as characterized by other characteristics. If they function otherwise, they impart no information whatever. Even a single word constituted of its root and affix embodies several determinate constituents of meaning and a sentence conveys the combination of such determinate meanings as it is a combination of words with determinate meanings.

२७. अथ स्यात्—नास्माभिर्निर्विशेषे स्वयम्प्रकाशे वस्तुनि शब्दः प्रमाणमित्युच्यते, स्वतस्सिद्धस्य प्रमाणानपेक्षत्वात्; सर्वैश्शब्दैः तदुपरागविशेषाः ज्ञातृत्वादयः सर्वे निवर्त्यन्ते; सर्वेषु विशेषेषु निवृत्तेषु वस्तुमात्रम् अनवच्छिन्नं स्वयम्प्रकाशं स्वत एवावतिष्ठत इति ।

**27.** It may be objected as follows: Now, we do not hold that scripture is a means for knowing about the undifferentiated and self-luminous Reality. The Reality being self-evident does not stand in need of any proof. The scriptural statements only serve to negate the differentiations like being the subject, object or process of knowing, which differentiations eclips the self-luminous principle. When all such eclipsing differentiations are eliminated, the pure

Reality, unconditioned and self-revealing, abides by its own right.

२८. नैतदेवम्—केन शब्देन तद्वस्तु निर्दिश्य तद्गाता विशेषा निरस्यन्ते "ज्ञप्तिमात्रशब्देन" इति चेन्न । सोऽपि सविशेषमेव वस्तु अवलम्बते, प्रकृतिप्रत्ययरूपेण विशेषगर्भत्वादेव । "ज्ञा अवबोधने" इति, सकर्मकः, सकर्तृकः, क्रियाविशेषः । क्रियान्तरव्यावर्तकस्वभावविशेषश्च प्रकृत्या अवगम्यते; प्रत्ययेन च लिङ्गसङ्ख्यादयः । स्वतस्सिद्धावपि एतत्स्वभावविशेषविरहे सिद्धिरेव न स्यात् । अन्यसाधनस्वभावतया हि ज्ञप्तेः स्वतस्सिद्धिरुच्यते ।

**28. (Reply):** This contention cannot stand. By what term is that reality indicated while negating the differentiations of it? It cannot be said that it is indicated by the term 'Pure Knowledge', for even that term points to a differentiated reality That term contains within itself both a root and affix and thereby has a determinate import. It represents by its root 'jñā' a particular activity (of the mind), which is related to an object and belongs to a subject. The process of knowing differentiates itself from all other activities. All this reference to a subject and object and difference from other operations is embodied in the meaning of the root 'jñā' (to know) itself. The affix points out the other particulars like gender and number. Even if knowledge is self-evident, it must be self-evident as such, as being of this determinate nature. Otherwise it is in no way evident. Further, the self-evident character of knowledge is proved on the ground that it is the cause of the revelation of other things.

२९. ब्रह्मस्वरूपं कृत्स्नं सर्वदा स्वयमेव प्रकाशते चेत्, न तस्मिन् अन्यधर्माध्यासः संभवति । न हि रज्जुस्वरूपे अवभासमाने सर्पत्वादिः अध्यस्यते । अत एव हि भवद्भिः "आच्छादिकाऽविद्या" अभ्युपगम्यते । ततश्च शास्त्रीयनिवर्तकज्ञानस्य ब्रह्मणि तिरोहितांशो विषयः । अन्यथा तस्य निवर्तकत्वं च

न स्यात् । अधिष्ठानातिरेकिरज्जुत्वप्रकाशनेन हि सर्पत्वं बाध्यते । एकश्चेद्विशेषो ज्ञानमात्रे वस्तुनि शब्देन अभिधीयते; स च ब्रह्मविशेषणं भवति इति, सर्वश्रुतिप्रतिपादितसर्वविशेषणविशिष्टं ब्रह्म भवति । अतः प्रामाणिकानां न केनापि प्रमाणेन निर्विशेषवस्तुसिद्धिः ।

**29.** Moreover, if the entire nature of Brahman shines by itself always, it would be impossible that the properties of anything else could be superimposed on it. Surely when the nature of the rope is fully apprehended, the snake cannot be superimposed on it. It is precisely for this reason that you postulate a nescience, that is supposed to conceal the real. It is for this reason again, it should be held that scriptural knowledge destructive of the world-illusion, must be about that part of Brahman which is concealed. Otherwise it cannot destroy the illusion. Indeed the 'snakeness', superimposed on the rope can be climinated only by the apprehension of its 'ropeness', which latter aspect is over and above that aspect of rope which was apprehended even through the illusion. If you admit some one differentiating attribute characterizing pure knowledge and admit that this attribute is connoted by the word standing for Brahman, the logical consequence would be that Brahman characterized by all the attributes,affirmed by all the scriptural texts, must be admitted. Therefore, for those who go by proofs, there is no proof for an undifferentiated reality.

३०. निर्विकल्पकप्रत्यक्षेऽपि सविशेषमेव वस्तु प्रतीयते । अन्यथा सविकल्पके सोऽयमिति पूर्वावगतप्रकारविशिष्टप्रत्ययानुपपत्तेः; वस्तुसंस्थानविशेषरूपत्वात् गोत्वादेः, निर्विकल्पकदशायामपि ससंस्थानमेव वस्तु "इत्थम्" इति प्रतीयते । द्वितीयादिप्रत्ययेषु तस्यैव संस्थानविशेषस्य अनेकवस्तुनिष्ठतामात्रं प्रतीयते । संस्थानरूपप्रकाराख्यस्य पदार्थस्य अनेकवस्तुनिष्ठतया अनेकवस्तुविशेषणत्वं द्वितीयादिप्रत्ययावगम्यमिति द्वितीयादिप्रत्ययाः सविकल्पका

इत्युच्यन्ते । अत एव एकस्य पदार्थस्य भिन्नाभिन्नरूपेण विरुद्धं द्वयात्मकत्वं प्रत्युक्तम् । संस्थानस्य संस्थानिनः प्रकारतया पदार्थान्तरत्वं, प्रकारत्वादेव पृथक्सिद्ध्यनर्हत्वं, पृथगनुपलम्भश्चेति न द्वयात्मकत्वसिद्धिः ।

**30.** Even in the case of indeterminate perception, an object distinguished by characteristics is apprehended. Otherwise in determinate perception the recognition of the characteristics previously observed (in the indeterminate perception) would not occur as in the perceptual judgement, 'This is he'. The characteristics like 'cowness' are of the nature of the structure (form) of the objects. In the state of indeterminate perception also, objects are apprehended as characterized by their structures as in the perceptual judgement, 'This of this character'. In the second and later apprehensions the commonness of the same form to other objects is cognized. The second and latter perceptions are designated determinate, because in them the possession of the same structure as their characteristic by many objects is grasped. For the same reason, the view maintaining both the difference and identity of things, and thus positing the (self-contradictory) twofoldness of reality stands rejected as untenable. Structure being the mode of a substance, is different from its substantive essence. Because it is a mode, it does not exist independently of its substantive substratum. Because it is a mode, it is not cognized independently of the substance of which it is the mode. For these reasons, the twofold character as unity and difference cannot be affirmed of reality.

३१. अपि च निर्विशेषवस्तुवादिना स्वयम्प्रकाशे वस्तुनि तदुपरागविशेषाः सर्वैश्शब्दैः निषिध्यन्ते इति वदता, के ते शब्दा निषेधका इति वक्तव्यम् । "वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्" इति, विकारनामधेययोः वाचारम्भणमात्रत्वात्, यत्तत्र कारणतया उपलक्ष्यते वस्तुमात्रं तदेव सत्यम्, अन्यदसत्यमिति इयं श्रुतिर्वदति ।

**31.** And again those who assert that Reality is undifferentiated and that particular characterizations eclipsing the self-luminous Reality are eliminated by scriptural texts must point out what such eliminating texts are.

**(Objection):** 'On speech depend changes and names, but clay alone is true (*Chā. VI, I*, 4)' is what is stated. It means that modifications and names have no basis except mere words; and what is indicated there as the cause, is the only Reality and all else is unreal.

३२. इति चेत्, नैतदुपपद्यते । एकस्मिन् विज्ञाते सर्वमिदं विज्ञातं भवतीति प्रतिज्ञाते अन्यज्ञानेन अन्यज्ञानसंभवम् मन्वानस्य एकमेव वस्तु विकाराद्यवस्थाविशेषेण पारमार्थिकेनैव नानारूपमवस्थितं चेत्, तत्र एकस्मिन् विज्ञाते तस्मात् विलक्षणसंस्थानान्तरमपि तदेव वस्तु इति तत्र दृष्टान्तोऽयं निदर्शितः । नात्र कस्यचित् विशेषस्य निषेधकः कोऽपि शब्दो दृश्यते । वाचारम्भणमिति—वाचा व्यवहारेण, आरभ्यते इति आरम्भणम् । पिण्डरूपसंस्थितायाः मृत्तिकायाः नाम च अन्यत्, व्यवहारश्च अन्यः; घटशरावादिरूपेण अवस्थितायाः तस्या एव मृत्तिकाया अन्यानि, नामानि, व्यवहारश्च अन्यादृशाः, तथाऽपि सर्वत्र मृत्तिकाद्रव्यमेकमेव । नानासंस्थाननानानामधेयाभ्यां नानाव्यवहारेण च आरभ्यत इति एतदेव सत्यम् इत्यनेन, अन्यज्ञानेन अन्यज्ञानसम्भवो निदर्शितः । नात्र किञ्चिद्वस्तु निषिध्यत इति पूर्वमेव अयमर्थः प्रपञ्चितः ।

**32. (Reply):** If this be said, we urge that such an explanation is unreasonable. As the knowledge of the 'one' is declared to lead to the knowledge of 'all', the pupil questions the possibility of the knowledge of one entity leading to the knowledge of others. In reply it is maintained by the teacher that if one substance itself takes on, through actual modifications, a plurality of real forms, then the knowing of that one substance leads to the knowledge of its modifications, for though they have forms different from the causal form,

there is continuity of substantive essence. For explaining this principle, the illustration under discussion is offered. It denies no differentiation as alleged. The text means as follows: "Through Speech" means through practical use commencing with verbal reference. 'Ārambhaṇa' means association. The clay having the form of a lump has a different name and different uses. The same clay having the form of a pot etc., for instance, has different names and different uses. Even then the same clay-substance takes different names, different forms and serves different purposes. Thus the substance, clay, is real all through. Thus the possibility of knowing one thing by knowing another is exemplified. That this passage negates nothing has already been explained.

३३. अपि च "येनाश्रुतं श्रुतम्" इत्यादिना ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तस्य सर्वस्य मिथ्यात्वं प्रतिज्ञातं चेत्, "यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन" इत्यादिदृष्टान्तः साध्यविकलस्स्यात् । रज्जुसर्पादिवत् मृत्तिकाविकारस्य घटशरावादेरसत्यत्वं श्वेतकेतोः शुश्रूषोः प्रमाणान्तरेण, युक्त्या च असिद्धमिति; एतदपि सिषाधयिषितमिति चेत्, यथा इति दृष्टान्ततया उपादानं न घटते ।

**33.** If you were to argue that the proposition, 'By which that which was not heard of, becomes heard of (*Chā. VI, I,* 3)' etc., means that everything other than Brahman is unreal, we urge in reply that, in that case, the illustration of clay and its modification (*Chā. VI, I,* 4) would not serve to establish that purport. That clay-products like a jar are unreal, like the snake-in-the-rope, is not a point that is obvious and well-known to Svetaketu through any other valid source of knowledge and reasoning. If it be said, 'Even that point is sought to be established in this proposition', we say that it cannot be the case for if so, reference to the illustration as a previously well-established matter would be impossible.

३४. "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् एकमेवाद्वितीयम्" इत्यत्र "सदेव" "एकमेव" इति अवधारणद्वयेन, "अद्वितीयम्" इत्यनेन च सन्मात्रातिरेकिसजातीयविजातीयाः, सर्वे विशेषाः निषिध्यन्त इति प्रतीयते इति चेत्, नैतदेवम् । कार्यकारणभावावस्थाद्वयावस्थितस्य एकस्य वस्तुनः एकावस्थस्य ज्ञानेन अवस्थान्तरावस्थितस्यापि वस्त्वैक्येन ज्ञाततां दृष्टान्तेन दर्शयित्वा, श्वेतकेतोरप्रज्ञातं सर्वस्य ब्रह्मकारणत्वं वक्तुं "सदेव सोम्येदम्" इत्यारब्धम् ।

**34. (Objection):** But, by the two terms of exclusive emphasis in the phrases, 'Being **alone**' and 'One **only**' and by the expression, 'Without a second' all entities other than pure Being both of the same kind as well as of a different kind are repudiated.

**(Reply):** The reply to this is that the matter is not so. That the same substance is the cause in one state and is the effect in another state and that by the understanding of that substance in its causal state, we understand it as existing in another state also owing to the continuity of substance are the principles that are explained to Śvetaketu with illustrations. Then the fundamental truth that Brahman is the cause of all, altogether unknown to Śvetaketu, is introduced in the words, 'Being itself, this was in the beginning'.

३५. 'इदमग्रे सदेवासीत्' इति । अग्र इति कालविशेषः । इदंशब्दवाच्यस्य प्रपञ्चस्य सदापत्तिरूपां क्रियां, सद्द्रव्यतां च वदति । "एकमेव" इति च अस्य नानानामरूपविकारप्रहाणम् । एतस्मिन् प्रतिपादिते अस्य जगतः सदुपादानता प्रतिपादिता भवति । अन्यत्र उपादानकारणस्य स्वव्यतिरिक्ताधिष्ठात्रपेक्षादर्शनेऽपि, सर्वविलक्षणत्वादस्य सर्वज्ञस्य ब्रह्मणः सर्वशक्तियोगो न विरुद्ध इति, 'अद्वितीय'-पदम् अधिष्ठात्रन्तरं निवारयति । सर्वशक्तियुक्तत्वादेव ब्रह्मणः, काश्चन श्रुतयः प्रथमम् उपादानकारणत्वं प्रतिपाद्य, निमित्तकारणमपि तदेवेति प्रतिपादयन्ति, यथेयं श्रुतिः ।

**35.** It means, 'This, in the beginning, was Being itself'. The words, 'In the beginning' signify a particular period of time, and the term 'was' signifies a particular mode of activity consisting of fusion with Being implying that the world has Being as its substantive essence. The words 'One only' signify that differentiations of names and forms were non-existent then. When these ideas are clearly laid down, it becomes manifest that the world has 'Being' as its material cause. In other cases of causation, the material cause, requires an efficient cause other than itself. But in this case of cosmic causation the omnscient Brahman, being unique, transcendent and being distinguished from everything else, there is no contradiction involved in its being omnipotent. The words 'without a second' affirm the absence of another intelligent cause. This wholly follows from the omnipotence of Brahman. Some texts state first that Brahman is the material cause and then add that the efficient cause is also Brahman itself. To this class of texts belongs the present passage.

**३६.** अन्यश्च श्रुतयः ब्रह्मणो निमित्तकारणतामनुज्ञाय, तस्य उपादानतादि कथमिति परिचोद्य, सर्वशक्तियुक्तत्वात् उपादानकारणं, तदितराशेषोपकरणं च ब्रह्मैव इति परिहरन्ति । "किंस्विद्वनम्? क उ स वृक्ष आसीत्?--यतो द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः, मनीषिनो मनसा पृच्छते दु तत्, यदध्यतिष्ठद्भुवनानि धारयन्", "ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत्. यतो द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः मनीषिणो मनसा विब्रवीमि वः ब्रह्माध्यतिष्ठद्भुवनानि धारयन्" इति । सामान्यतो दृष्टेन विरोधमाशङ्क्य ब्रह्मणस्सर्वविलक्षणत्वेन परिहार उक्तः ।

**36.** Other texts begin with the statement that Brahman is the efficient cause and then raise the question as to how it can be the material cause also and develop the answer that Brahman, being omnipotent, can be the material cause also

and all other accessory causes as well. The following passage (*Ṛg*. *X*, *VI*, *XIII*, 4) is an instance in point: 'What was the wood, what was the tree, from which they shaped the heaven and earth? You wise ones, search in your minds; where on he stood, supporting the worlds? Brahman was the wood, Brahman the tree from which they shaped heaven and earth; you, wise ones, I tell you, he stood on Brahman, supporting the worlds'. The oneness of the material and efficient cause is questioned on the ground of the common conception of causation and is supported in answer, on the ground of the uniqueness and uncommon power of Brahman.

३७. अत: "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यत्रापि, अग्र इत्याद्यनेकविशेषा: ब्रह्मण: प्रतिपादिता: । भवदभिमतविशेषनिषेधवाची कोऽपि शब्द: न दृश्यते । प्रत्युत जगद्ब्रह्मणो: कार्यकारणभावज्ञापनाय "अग्र" इति कालविशेषसद्भाव:, "आसीत्" इति क्रियाविशेष:, जगदुपादानता जगन्निमित्तता च निमित्तोपादानयोर्भेदनिरसनेन तस्यैव ब्रह्मण: सर्वशक्तियोगश्चेति, अप्रजाता: सहस्रशो विशेषा एव प्रतिपादिता: ।

**37.** Therefore in the very statement, 'Being alone, this was in the beginning (*Chā*. *VI*, *II*, 1)' several differentiations are affirmed in relation to Brahman by phrases like 'in the beginning'. There is not a single word whatever which nagates distinctions as you desire. 'In the beginning' implies the existence of a specific time. 'Was' implies a specific mode of action. The attribute of being the material cause and the attribute of being the efficient cause are also ascribed to Brahman. The denial of the dualism of material and efficient causes brings in the all-accomplishing power of Brahman. Thus differentiations are posited in thousands, which are not matters of previous knowledge.

३८. यतो वास्तवकार्यकारणभावादिज्ञापने प्रवृत्तम्; अत एव "असदेवेदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यारभ्य, असत्कार्यवादनिषेधश्च क्रियते, "कुतस्तु खलु

सोम्यैवं स्यात्" इति । "प्रागसतः उत्पत्तिः अहेतुका" इत्यर्थः । तदेव उपपादयति "कथमसतस्सज्जायेत" इति । असत उत्पन्नम् असदात्मकमेव भवति इत्यर्थः, यथा मृद उत्पन्नं घटादिकं मृदात्मकम् । सत उत्पत्तिर्नाम व्यवहारविशेषहेतुभूतः अवस्थाविशेषयोगः ।

**38.** The passage propounds a real causal relation between Brahman and the world. Precisely for this reason it undertakes to refute the view that the effect does not pre-exist in the cause. To this effect is the section starting from, 'Non-being alone this was in the beginning (*Chā. VI, II*, 2)'. It goes on, 'How can that be? If the effect, it is urged in criticism, does not pre-exist in its cause, its origination amounts to causeless origination. It asks, 'How can Being originate from Non-being?' That which originates from Non-being must be of the nature of Non-being, even as a product of clay is of the nature of clay. The origination of something that is already existent means just its passage into a new state in order to make a new use possible.

३९. एतदुक्तं भवति—एकमेव कारणभूतद्रव्यम् अवस्थान्तरयोगेन कार्यमित्युच्यत इति एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं प्रतिपिपादयिषितम् । तत् असत्कार्यवादे न सेत्स्यति । तथा हि—निमित्तसमवाय्यसमवायिप्रभृतिभिः कारणैः अवयव्याख्यं कार्यं द्रव्यान्तरमेव आरभ्यत इति कारणभूताद्वस्तुनः कार्यस्य वस्त्वन्तरत्वात् न तज्ज्ञानेन अस्य ज्ञातता कथमपि सम्भवतीति; कथम् अवयवि द्रव्यान्तरम् निरस्यते इति चेत्, कारणगतावस्थान्तरयोगस्य द्रव्यान्तरोत्पत्तिवादिनः सम्प्रतिपन्नस्यैव एकत्वनामान्तरव्यवहारादेरुपपादकत्वात्, द्रव्यान्तरादर्शनाच्च इति कारणमेव अवस्थान्तरापन्नं कार्यमित्युच्यते इत्युक्तम् ।

**39.** The position concerning causation out of the previous existence of the effect can be explained as follows: The same causal substance is called effect by passing into a different state. On this basis the knowledge of 'one' leading to the knowledge of 'all' was elucidated. That account of one

knowledge leading to all knowledge is objected to by the theory of causation on which the effect does not pre-exist as the cause. That theory may be put thus: Out of the efficient, material and instrumental causes, a new substance, a new composite entity, other than all the causal factors comes into being. The entity that constitutes the effect is, in consequence, different from the entity constituting the cause. Hence the knowledge of cause can, in no way, render the effects known. How can the novel composite entity be repudiated? In reply to this it may be said that the causal substance (or substances) undergoes a change or enters into a new state of being according to all theories including the present theory asserting the origination of a new substance. This passage of the causal substance into a new state can itself account for the three factors, the unity of the effect, its bearing a new name and its capacity to serve a new purpose and such other factors to account for which the origination of a new entity is posited. And also no new substance is observed in the effect, over and above, the constitutive elements in a new state of being. For these reasons, it is maintained that the cause itself passing into a new state of being constitutes the effect.

**४०.** ननु निरधिष्ठानभ्रमासम्भवज्ञापनाय असत्कार्यवादनिरासः क्रियते । तथा हि—एकं चिद्रूपं सत्यमेव अविद्याशबलं जगद्रूपेण विवर्तते इति, अविद्याश्रयत्वाय मूलकारणं सत्यमित्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् इति असत्कार्यवादनिरासः । नैतदेवम् । एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तमुखेन सत्कार्यवादस्यैव प्रसक्तत्वात् इत्युक्तम् ।

**40. (Objection):** Now this is not the purport of the (Upaniṣad) discussion. The idea of the origination of a new substance in causation is repudiated just to establish that all illusion rests upon the substratum of reality. The only reality, pure consciousness, enmeshed in nescience appears falsely as

the world. The reality of the primordial cause must be presupposed as furnishing the substratum for that nescience. It is for this purpose that the origination of the previously non-existent is disproved in the passage.

**(Reply):** This way of construing the text is not correct. The theory of the origination of an effect from its own previous existence becomes relevant to and its consideration is directly necessitated by the initial proposition about the knowledge of the one issuing in the knowledge of all and the illustrations offered in support.

४१. भवत्पक्षे निरधिष्ठानभ्रमासम्भवस्य दुरुपपादत्वाच्च । यस्य हि चेतनगतो दोषः पारमार्थिकः दोषाश्रयत्वं च पारमार्थिकं, पारमार्थिक-दोषेण युक्तस्य, अपारमार्थिकगन्धर्वनगरादिदर्शनमुपपन्नम् । यस्य तु दोषश्च अपारमार्थिकः, दोषाश्रयत्वं च अपारमार्थिकं, तस्य अपारमार्थिकेनाप्याश्रयेण तदुपपन्नमिति भवत्पक्षे न निरधिष्ठानभ्रमासम्भवः ।

**41.** On your theory it is impossible to maintain that an illusion rests on a real basis. If a thinker admits that a sentient being is subject to real defects, and that its liability to defects is real, then only can he account for the fact of illusion, the real defects producing the perception of unreal phenomena. But for a philosopher, according to whom the defects are unreal and the liability to defects is also unreal, it should not be impossible to admit an illusion on a fictitious basis as well. Therefore you cannot rule out the possibility of illusion resting on a fictitious substratum.

४२. शोधकेष्वपि "सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म", "आनन्दो ब्रह्म" इत्यादिषु सामानाधिकरण्यव्युत्पत्तिसिद्धानेकगुणविशिष्टैकार्थाभिधानम् अविरुद्धमिति, सर्वगुणविशिष्टं ब्रह्म अभिधीयत इति पूर्वमेवोक्तम् । "अथात आदेशो नेति नेति" इति बहुधा निषेधो दृश्यत इति चेत्, किमत्र निषिध्यत इति वक्तव्यम् । "द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्तं चामूर्तमेव च" इति मूर्तामूर्तात्मकः

प्रपञ्चस्सर्वोऽपि निषिध्यत इति चेत्, ब्रह्मणो रूपतया अप्रज्ञातं सर्वं रूपतया उपदिश्य पुनस्तदेव निषेद्धुमयुक्तम् । "प्रक्षालनाद्धि पङ्कस्य दूरादस्पर्शनं वरम्" इति न्यायात् ।

**42.** Coming to those passages in the scriptures which aim at determining the nature of Brahman, the direction of interpretation has already been laid down. The definitive sentences like 'Brahman is real, knowledge and infinite (*Tai. II*, 2)' and 'Brahman is bliss (*Tai. III*, 6)' following the principle of co-ordinate predication, define Brahman as characterized by plurality of qualities. There is no contradiction involved in the procedure. Brahman characterized by all the qualities is thus presented. If it be said that negation is conveyed in many ways as in the declaration, 'Then, therefore, the instruction is, "Not so, not so" (*Bṛ. IV, III*, 6)' we urge that what exactly is negated here must be determined. If it is pointed out that the whole universe consisting of forms and formless principles as enumerated in the sentence, 'There are two aspects of Brahman that with form and that without form (*Bṛ. IV, III*, 1)' is negated here by the instruction 'Not so, not so', we contend that this is an unreasonable method of interpretation. After imparting the knowledge that all that, which from the normal empirical point of view is not known as an aspect of Brahman, constitutes an aspect of Brahman, to go on to negate it is surely a very unreasonable method of discourse. The rule is that 'it is better to avoid mire from a distance than to wash it off after staining oneself with it'.

४३. कस्तर्हि निषेधकवाक्यार्थः ? सूत्रकारः स्वयमेव वदति — "प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति, ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः" इति । उत्तरत्र "अथ नामधेयं, सत्यस्य सत्यमिति प्राणा वै सत्यं, तेषामेष सत्यम्" इत्यादिना गुणगणस्य प्रतिपादितत्वात् पूर्वप्रकृतैतावन्मात्रं न भवति ब्रह्मेति, ब्रह्मण एतावन्मात्रता प्रतिषिध्यन्ते इति सूत्रस्यार्थः ।

**43.** Then, what is the import of this negative proposition? The author of the *Vedānta-Sūtras* (*III*, *II*, 22) himself furnishes the interpretation: 'That the aforesaid pirnciples exhaust the forms of Brahman is what is denied, just because the passage goes on to speak of the further glories of Brahman.' The further text of the śruti is 'Then its name is "The real of the reals", for life-principles are real and this is more real than life-principles (*Bṛ. IV*, *III*, 6)'. Thus further attributes are praised in the subsequent portions of the text. Therefore the text, 'Not so, not so' fundamentally means that Brahman is not confined to the aspects enumerated. Thus the finitude of Brahman is what is denied in the text in question.

४४. "नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन" इत्यादिना नानात्वप्रतिषेध एव दृश्यत इति चेत्, अत्रापि उत्तरत्र "सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः" इति सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वसर्वेश्वरत्वप्रतिपादनात्, चेतनाचेतनवस्तुशरीरः ईश्वर इति सर्वप्रकारसंस्थितः सर्वेश्वरः स एक एवेति, तत्प्रत्यनीकाब्रह्मात्मकनानात्वं प्रतिषिद्धं, न भवदभिमतम् । सर्वासु एवम्प्रकारासु श्रुतिषु इयमेव स्थितिः इति, न क्वचिदपि ब्रह्मणः सविशेषत्वनिषेधवाची कोऽपि शब्दो दृश्यते ।

**44.** If it be said that the dictum, 'There is no plurality here (*Bṛ. VI*, *IV*, 19)' and many other texts repudiate plurality, we explain as follows: The text adduced is followed immediately in the same discourse of the Upaniṣad by the glorification of the 'Ruler of all, the Lord of all (*Bṛ. VI*, *IV*, 22)'. The subsequent texts assert that Brahman's will comes true and that Brahman is the Lord of all. The truth is that the supreme ruler has all sentient and non-sentient entities as his body and has them as his modes. He is the sole lord of all existence. Plurality of existence as not sustained and ensouled by Brahman is repudiated in this passage. It is this plurality, antithetical to the assertion of the absolute supremacy of the highest Self that is denied. So this denial of plurality does not meet the requirements of your position. All texts of this

character follow this fundamental principle. Nowhere, therefore, do we meet with a scriptural utterance that repudiates all differentiations.

४५. अपि च निर्विशेषज्ञानमात्रं ब्रह्म, तच्च आच्छादिकाऽविद्यातिरोहितस्वस्वरूपं स्वगतनानात्वं पश्यति इत्ययमर्थो न घटते । तिरोधानं नाम प्रकाशनिवारणम् । स्वरूपातिरेकिप्रकाशधर्मानभ्युपगमेन, प्रकाशस्यैव स्वरूपत्वात् स्वरूपनाश एव स्यात् । प्रकाशपर्यायं ज्ञानं नित्यं, स च प्रकाशः अविद्यातिरोहित इति बालिशभाषितमिदम् । अविद्यया प्रकाशस्तिरोहित इति प्रकाशस्यानुत्पाद्यत्वात् स्वरूपनाश एव स्यात् । प्रकाशः नित्यो निर्विकारस्तिष्ठति इति चेत्, सत्यमप्यविद्यायां ब्रह्मणि न किञ्चित्तिरोहितम् इति, नानात्वं पश्यति इति भवतामयं व्यवहारः सत्सु अनिर्वचनीय एव ।

**45.** Further you hold that pure undifferentiated knowledge is Brahman and having its essential nature veiled by the veiling nesicence, it observes pluralities within itself. Now this is an untenable doctrine. Veiling means elimination of light. As you do not admit an attributive light distinct from the substantive nature of Brahman, and as you hold that the substantive nature of Brahman is this light of knowledge, the postulated elimination of light would be the destruction of the substantive nature of Brahman. If it be said, 'Light here means knowledge. Knowledge is eternal. The light of knowledge is veiled by nescience', we say in reply that these are contentions indicative of immaturity of thought. If the light is concealed by nescience, this concealment should take one of these two forms: It must obstruct the generation of light or it must annihilate the existing light. Since you do not admit that this light is subject to processes like generation, the concealment posited can be nothing but annihilation. When you assert that it is eternal and immutable and it abides as such, you are saying in effect that though nescience is there, nothing is concealed in Brahman. In the same

breath you say that Brahman observes plurality. Surely a doctrine like this cannot be submitted to the scrutiny of those who know.

४६. ननु च भवतोऽपि विज्ञानस्वरूप आत्मा अभ्युपगन्तव्यः, स च स्वयम्प्रकाशः । तस्य देवादिस्वरूपात्माभिमाने स्वरूपप्रकाशतिरोधानमवश्याश्रयणीयम् । स्वरूपप्रकाशे सति स्वात्मनि आकारान्तराध्यासायोगात् । अतो भवतश्च समानोऽयं दोषः । किञ्च अस्माकमेकस्मिन्नेव आत्मनि भवदुदीरितं दुर्घटत्वम्; भवताम् आत्मानन्त्याभ्युपगमात्, सर्वेष्वयं दोषः परिहरणीयः ।

**46. (Objection):** But you too must hold that the essential nature of the Ātman is consciousness. Ātman is self luminous. To account for its wrong identification with the body, the concealment of the essential nature must be postulated. If the nature of an entity stands revealed, it is impossible that characteristics that do not belong to it can be wrongly attributed to it. Therefore, the difficulty, you urge against us, faces you also. Indeed the position is far worse for you. Since we maintain that there is only one self, the unaccountability urged, attaches to our account of that one single entity. As you uphold the existence of an infinite number of selves, you have to face this charge of unaccountability in your account of all those infinite number of entities.

४७. अत्रोच्यते—स्वभावतः मलप्रत्यनीकानन्तज्ञानानन्दैकस्वरूपं, स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयापरिमितोदारगुणसागरं, निमेष-काष्ठा-कला-मुहूर्तादि-परार्धपर्यन्तापरिमित-व्यवच्छेदस्वरूप-सर्वोत्पत्तिस्थितिविनाशादि-सर्वपरिणाम-निमित्तभूत-कालकृतपरिणामास्पृष्टानन्तमहाविभूति, स्वलीलापरिकरस्वांशभूतानन्त-बद्ध-मुक्त-नानाविधचेतन-तद्भोग्यभूतानन्तविचित्रपरिणामशक्तिचेतनेतरवस्तुजातान्तर्यामित्वकृत-सर्वशरीरत्व-सर्वप्रकारावस्थानावस्थितं, परं ब्रह्म च वेद्यं, तत्साक्षात्कारक्षमभगवद्द्वैपायन-पराशर-वाल्मीकि-मनु-याज्ञवल्क्य-गौतमापस्तम्बप्रभृतिमुनिगणप्रणीत-विध्यर्थवाद-मन्त्ररूव-वेदमूलेतिहासपुराण-

**धर्मशास्त्रोपबृंहित-परमार्थभूतानादिनिधनाविच्छिन्नसम्प्रदाय-ऋग्यजुस्सामाथर्व-रूपानन्तशाखं वेदं च अभ्युपगच्छतामस्माकं किं न सेत्स्यति ?**

**47.** **(Reply):** Our thesis about the Reality and the ways of knowing can be formulated in this way: The supreme Brahman is by its inherent nature antiheritical to all imperfections. Its substantive nature consists solely of infinite knowledge and bliss. It is an ocean of exalted attributes which are natural to it and are all-surpassing in their excellence. Its glories are boundless and not tainted by mutations in time, time which is the operative principle of change in the form of origination, subsistence and destruction and consists of limitless number of units, like seconds, minutes, hours upto vast epochs. Brahman has as the instruments of its mighty sport and as forming its own parts an infinite number of individual souls bound as well as free and also the physical universe, which latter has the power of passing through evolutions marvellous and boundless. Brahman is the inner ruler of the finite selves and the non-sentient nature. They form its body. It owns them as its modes. Such supreme Brahman is the reality to be known. The Veda, *Ṛk*, *Yajus*, *Sāman* and *Atharvan*, branching forth thousandfold, beginningless and endless in its unbroken tradition, embodying the ultimate truth, is the basis of philosophical knowledge. This, in all its three sections, namely, injunctions, explanations and hymns, is supported and interpreted by the Itihāsas, Purāṇas, and Dharmaśāstras, composed by the great sages, like Bhagavān Dvaipāyana, Parāśara, Vālmīki, Manu, Yājñāvalkya, Gautama and Āpastamba, who have attained the direct vision of the supreme Brahman. This body of transcendent knowledge, interpreted and augmented in the supplementary sacred texts of these perfect sages, is the final authority. Can there be any insuperable difficulty for us, possessed of this magnificent conception of knowledge and reality?

४८. यथोक्तं भगवता द्वैपायनेन महाभारते—
यो मामजमनादिं च वेत्ति लोकमहेश्वरम् ॥
द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च ।
क्षरस्सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते ॥
उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः ।
यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः ॥
कालं स पचते तत्र न कालस्तत्र वै प्रभुः ।
एते वै निरयास्तात स्थानस्य परमात्मनः ॥
अव्यक्तादिविशेषान्तं परिणामर्द्धिसंयुतम् ।
क्रीडा हरेरिदं सर्वं क्षरमित्यवधार्यताम् ॥
कृष्ण एव हि लोकानामुत्पत्तिरपि चाप्ययः ।
कृष्णस्य हि कृते भूतमिदं विश्वं चराचरम् ॥ इति ॥
कृष्णस्य हि कृते इति । कृष्णस्य शेषभूतमित्यर्थः ।

**48.** Bhagavan Dvaipāyana says in the *Mahābhārata* 'He who knows me, the birthless, and beginningless One, the supreme Lord of the worlds (*Gītā, X*, 3)' and 'There are two persons in the world, the perishable and the imperishable. All creatures are the perishable puruṣa. The immutable One is the imperishable puruṣa. The puruṣa who is other than and far surpassing these two is called the supreme Ātman. He fills the three worlds and sustains them. He is the everlasting Godhead, (*Gītā, XV*, 26)'. 'Time is subdued there by him. Time is not the master there. All these are places of punishement in contrast to the blessed region of the highest Ātman' and 'All this, beginning from the unmanifested to the particular objects in creation, is subject to mutation and growth. Let all this be understood as the perishable embodiment of Hari's cosmic play (*Bhā. Mokṣa, XXV*, 9)'. 'Kṛṣṇa is the beginning and the end of all the worlds. The entire universe of animate and inanimate existences is for his sake (*Bhā. Sabhā, XXXVIII*, 23)'. The terms 'for his sake' mean that it has value only in being instrumental to him.

४९. भगवता पराशरेणाप्येवमुक्तम् —

शुद्धे महाविभूत्याख्ये परे ब्रह्मणि शब्द्यते ।
मैत्रेय भगवच्छब्दस्सर्वकारणकारणे ॥
ज्ञानशक्तिबलैश्वर्यवीर्यतेजांस्यशेषत: ।
भगवच्छब्दवाच्यानि विना हेयैर्गुणादिभि: ॥
एवमेष महाशब्दो मैत्रेय भगवानिति ।
परमब्रह्मभूतस्य वासुदेवस्य नान्यग: ॥
तत्र पूज्यपदार्थोक्तिपरिभाषासमन्वित: ।
शब्दोऽयं नोपचारेण त्वन्यत्र ह्युपचारत: ॥
एवम्प्रकारममलं नित्यं व्यापकमक्षयम् ।
समस्तहेयरहितं विष्ण्वाख्यं परमं पदम् ॥
कलामुहूर्तादिमयश्च कालो न यद्विभूते: परिणामहेतु: ।
क्रीडतो बालकस्येव चेष्टां तस्य निशामय ॥ इत्यादि ॥

**49.** Bhagavān Parāśara also says: 'Maitreya, the name "Bhagavat" is applied to the pure One of infinite glory, to the supreme Brahman, who is the cause of all causes (*Vi*, *VI*, *V* 72)' 'The word "Bhagavat" signifies knowledge, power of action, sustaining strength, sovereignty (in rule), energy and radiance. It signifies these perfections in their entirety and also the total exclusion of evil attributes (*Vi*, *VI*, *V*, 79)'. 'Thus the great name "Bhagavat" denotes Vāsudeva, the highest Brahman. It applies to none else. It also carries the significance of the word "adorable". Its application to the highest One, Vāsudeva, is direct and primary. When it is used for any one else, it is used in a secondary sense (*Vi*, *VI*, *V*, 75)'. 'Such is the ultimate ideal called "Viṣṇu". It is pure, real, omnipresent, and imperishable. It transcends all evil (*Vi*. *I*, *XXII*, 53)'. 'Time consisting of durational units like kala and muhūrta, has no power of affecting his glory with change (*Vi*, *IV*, *I*, 84)'. 'Look at him, sporting like a boy (*Vi*, *I*, *II*, 18)'.

५०. मनुनाऽपि —"प्रशासितारं सर्वेषामणीयांसमणीयसाम्"
इत्याद्युक्तम् ।
याज्ञवल्क्येनापि —"क्षेत्रज्ञस्येश्वरज्ञानाद्विशुद्धिः परमा मता"
इत्यादि ।
आपस्तम्बेनापि —"पूः प्राणिनस्सर्वगुहाशयस्य" इति ।
सर्वे प्राणिनः, गुहाशयस्य परमात्मनः, पूः पुरं शरीरमित्यर्थः । प्राणिन इति । जीवात्मकभूतसङ्घाताः ।

**50.** Manu also voices forth the same truth: 'He is the supreme law-giver for all. He is subtler than the subtlest (*Ma. XII*, 122)'. Yājñavalkya also says: 'The individual spirit attains the highest purity through the knowledge of God (34)'. Āpastamba has it thus: 'All prāṇis are the pūḥ of this One, the indweller in all caverns (*XX*, 4)'. Pūḥ means 'city'. That means body. 'Prāṇis' means creatures which are material configurations ensouled by individual selves.

५१. ननु च किमनेन आडम्बरेण? चोद्यं तु न परिहृतम्; उच्यते— एवमभ्युपगच्छतामस्माकम्, आत्मधर्मभूतस्य चैतन्यस्य स्वाभाविकस्यापि कर्मणा पारमार्थिकं सङ्कोचं विकासं च ब्रुवतां सर्वमिदं परिहृतम्; भवतस्तु प्रकाश एव स्वरूपमिति प्रकाशो न धर्मभूतः, तस्य सङ्कोचो विकासो वा नाभ्युपगम्यते । प्रकाशप्रसारानुत्पत्तिमेव तिरोधानभूताः कर्मादयः कुर्वन्ति । अविद्या चेत् तिरोधानं, तिरोधानभूतया तया, स्वरूपभूतप्रकाशनाशः पूर्वमेवोक्तः । अस्माकं तु अविद्यारूपेण कर्मणा स्वरूपनित्यधर्मभूतज्ञानप्रकाशः सङ्कुचितः, तेन देवादिरूपात्माभिमानो भवतीति विशेषः ।

**51. (Objection):** But what is the use of all this flourish? Our criticism remains unanswered.

**(Reply):** The answer follows. For us who hold this conception of Brahman and the Veda, the criticism has no force. Consciousness, we maintain, though an inherent attribute of the individual is subject to real contraction and expansion by the force of karma. Thus the difficulty urged

is eliminated. For you, consciousness is the substantive nature of the self and not its attribute. You do not admit either contraction or expansion. In our account, concealing factors like karma, bring about the non-origination of the spread of consciousness. If the nature of nescience is to veil, nescience, the agency that veils, must be, as urged before, destructive of the essential nature of consciousness itself. According to us karma, in the form of nescience, brings about the contraction of the consciousness that is an eternal attribute of the substantive nature of the ātman. By virtue of this contraction arises the wrong attitude to the self, taking it for gods, men, or any other empirical creature.

५२. यथोक्तम् —

अविद्या कर्मसंज्ञाऽन्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते ॥
यया क्षेत्रज्ञशक्तिस्सा वेष्टिता नृप सर्वगा ।
संसारतापानखिलान् अवाप्नोत्यतिसन्ततान् ॥
तया तिरोहितत्वाच्च शक्तिः क्षेत्रज्ञसंज्ञिता ।
सर्वभूतेषु भूपाल तारतम्येन वर्तते ॥ इति ॥

क्षेत्रज्ञानां स्वधर्मभूतज्ञानस्य कर्मसंज्ञया अविद्यया सङ्कोचं विकासं च दर्शयति ।

**52.** This position has been laid down thus: 'The third power is nescience called karma. By this, the all-penetrating power of the individual knower is over-powered. Hence it becomes subject to the persistent afflictions of saṁsāra. Concealed by nescience, the power, called the individual knower, exists in all creatures in various grades (*Vi. VI, VII*, 61–63)'. Thus the scripture points out that nescience, called karma, causes the contraction and expansion of the consciousness which forms a natural attribute of the individual self.

५३. अपि च आच्छादिका अविद्या, श्रुतिभिश्च ऐक्योपदेशबलाच्च ब्रह्मस्वरूपतिरोधानहेतुदोषरूपा आश्रीयते । तस्याश्च मिथ्यारूपत्वेन प्रपञ्चवत्

स्वदर्शनमूलदोषापेक्षत्वात्, न सा मिथ्यादर्शनमूलदोषस्स्यादिति ब्रह्मैव मिथ्यादर्शनमूलं स्यात्। तस्याश्च अनादित्वेऽपि मिथ्यारूपत्वादेव ब्रह्मदृश्यत्वेनैव अनादित्वात्, तद्दर्शनमूलपरमार्थदोषानभ्युपगमाच्च ब्रह्मैव तद्दर्शनमूलं स्यात्; तस्य नित्यत्वात् अनिर्मोक्ष एव।

**53. (Objection):** This principle of concealing nescience has been postulated for two reasons: Some sacred texts posit it and the teaching of identity between the jīva and Brahman necessitates it. It has been maintained that this nescience veils the nature of Brahman.

**(Reply):** Now, we argue that this nescience is also phenomenal and unreal. Just as the manifold world being unreal, can become an object of preception only owing to a defect, namely this nescience, this nescience also, being equally phenomenal, presupposes a defect to account for its becoming an object of perception. Therefore nescience itself cannot be considered the fundamental and original defect, at the root of all illusion. Thus you will be driven to regard Brahman itself as the root of all illusions. Even if nescience is considered beginningless, since it can be beginningless only as phenomenal and as such, only as an object of the perception of Brahman, and since you do not admit a real, non-phenomenal defects as its root, Brahman itself must be the source of the illusory perception of nescience. Brahman being eternal, it follows that there can be no liberation.

५४. अत एव इदमपि निरस्तम्। एकमेव शरीरं जीववत्, निर्जीवानीतराणि शरीराणि। यथा स्वप्नदृष्टनानाविधशरीराणां निर्जीवत्वम्। तत्र स्वप्ने द्रष्टुश्शरीरमेकमेव जीववत्। तस्य स्वप्नवेलायां दृश्यभूतनानाविधानन्तशरीराणां निर्जीवत्वमेव। अनेनैकेनैव परिकल्पितत्वात् जीवाः मिथ्याभूताः इति।

**54.** The foregoing refutes by implication the following also: Only one body is animated by a jīva. The other bodies are not so inhabited by jīvas, as in the case of bodies

seen in dreams. In dream, the body of the dreamer alone is ensouled. The many bodies that one observes in dreams are not ensouled. This one jīva of the dreamer fictitiously imagines the other jīvas and their bodies as existing. Therefore all (other) jīvas are unreal.

५५. ब्रह्मणा स्वस्वरूपव्यतिरिक्तस्य जीवभावस्य सर्वशरीराणां च कल्पितत्वात्, एकस्मिन्नपि शरीरे शरीरवत्, जीवसद्भावस्य मिथ्यारूपत्वात् सर्वाणि शरीराणि मिथ्यारूपाणि । तत्र जीवभावस्य मिथ्यारूप इति । एकस्य शरीरस्य तत्र जीवसद्भावस्य च न कश्चिद्विशेषः । अस्माकं तु स्वप्ने द्रष्टुश्शरीरस्य तस्मिन्नात्मसद्भावस्य च प्रबोधवेलायामबाधितत्वात्, अन्येषां शरीराणां तद्गतजीवानां च बाधितत्वात् ते सर्वे मिथ्याभूताः । स्वशरीरमेकं तस्मिन् जीवभावश्च परमार्थ इति विशेषः ।

**55.** Really on your hypothesis, Brahman fictitiously sets up in imagination individuation and all bodies, both of which are other than its essential nature. Even in a single body, since the body and likewise the individuation of the jīva in it, are unreal, all bodies are unreal and the individuation of the jīva in all of them is unreal. This being the case, there is no meaning in attaching any speciality to a single body and the individuation of the self in relation to it. In our account of the matter, the dreamer's body and the existence of the self in it, are not sublated in the waking state. The other bodies seen in dream and the individual souls embodied in them are sublated in the waking state. Therefore the latter are all unreal and the dreamer's body and soul are real. Herein lies the distinction.

५६. अपि च केन वा अविद्यानिवृत्तिः सा च कीदृशी इति विवेचनीयम् । ऐक्यज्ञानं निवर्तकं, निवृत्तिश्च अनिर्वचनीयप्रत्यनीकाकारा ।

**56.** Further, how is nescience eliminated? What is the nature of the elimination? These questions should be discussed.

**(Objection):** The unitive knowledge is the means for putting an end to nescience. The nature of that elimination of nescience lies in its being antithetical to the 'indefinable' nescience and its effects.

५७. इति चेत्, अनिर्वचनीयप्रत्यनीकं निर्वचनीयम् । तच्च सद्वा असद्वा द्विरूपं वा कोटचन्तरं न विद्यते । ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेण एतदभ्युपगमे पुनरप्यविद्या न निवृत्ता स्यात्; ब्रह्मैव चेन्निवृत्तिः, तत् प्रागप्यविशिष्टमिति, वेदान्तज्ञानात् पूर्वमेव निवृत्तिस्स्यात् । ऐक्यज्ञानं निवर्तकं, तदभावात् संसार इति भवद्दर्शनं विहन्यते ।

57. **(Reply):** If this be your view, the following objection arises. To be antithetical to the 'indefinable' is to be definable. The 'definable' must be either existent or non-existent or both. There is no fourth alternative. If this 'definable' termination of nescience is admitted to be other than Brahman, nescience (being the cause of the perception of everything other than Brahman) remains uneliminated. If Brahman itself is this elimination of nescience, the former being eternally real, this elimination must also be held to have existed eternally. Thus the elimination of nescience remains an accomplished fact prior to the rise of the knowledge of Vedānta. In consequence your philosophy holding that the unitive knowledge eliminates nescience and that the absence of the knowledge constitutes bondage stands nullified.

५८. किञ्च निवर्तकज्ञानस्याप्यविद्यारूपत्वात् तन्निवर्तनं केनेति वक्तव्यम् । निवर्तकज्ञानं स्वेतरसमस्तभेदं निवर्त्य, क्षणिकत्वादेव स्वयमेव विनश्यति । दावानलविषनाशनविषान्तवत् इति चेत्, न । निवर्तकज्ञानस्य ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तत्वेन तत्स्वरूप-तदुत्पत्तिविनाशानां मिथ्यारूपत्वात् तद्विनाशरूपा अविद्या तिष्ठत्येवेति, तद्विनाशदर्शनस्य निवर्तकं वक्तव्यमेव । दावाग्न्यादीनामपि पूर्वावस्थाविरोधिपरिणामपरम्परा अवर्जनीयैव ।

58. And again, the knowledge effecting the elimination of nescience is also, on your theory, a particular form of

nescience. Through what means is that specific form of nescience removed? 'This knowledge eliminating nescience, eliminates all differentiations first and then, being momentary, disappears by itself without any other cause bringing about its disappearance. There are instances of self-annihilation in nature, like forest-fire and poison administered to expel poison'. This argument is not open to you. This knowledge causing the termination of nescience is conceived by you as being other than Brahman. As such, its nature and the events connected with it like its origination and annihilation have only phenomenal existence. Therefore, the nescience, that consists in bringing about the perception of this phenomenal event, namely, the annihilation of the eliminating knowledge, continues to exist. You have to provide for the factor that eliminates the nescience which consists in the perception of the self-annihilation of the knowledge that brings about the elimination of cosmic nescience. In the case of forest-fire etc., what disappears continues to exist in states other than the previous one and this continuance in and through a chain of states obtains necessarily.

५९. अपि च चिन्मात्रब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तकृत्स्ननिषेधविषयज्ञानस्य कोऽयं ज्ञाता? अध्यासरूप: इति चेत्, न; तस्य निषेध्यतया निवर्तकज्ञानकर्मत्वात तत्कर्तुत्वानुपपत्तेः। ब्रह्मस्वरूपमेव इति चेत्, न। ब्रह्मण: निवर्तकज्ञानं प्रति ज्ञातृत्वं किं स्वरूपम्, उत अध्यस्तम्? अध्यस्तं चेत् अयमध्यास:, तन्मूलाविद्यान्तरं च निवर्तकज्ञानाविषयता तिष्ठत्येव। तन्निवर्तकान्तराभ्युपगमे, तयापि त्रिरूपतया अनवस्थैव। सर्वस्य हि ज्ञानस्य त्रिरूपत्वविरहे ज्ञानत्वमेव हीयते; कस्यचित् कञ्चन अर्थविशेषं प्रति सिद्धरूपत्वात्। ज्ञानस्य त्रिरूपत्वविरहे, भवतां स्वरूपभूतज्ञानवत् निवर्तकज्ञानमपि अनिवर्तकं स्यात्। ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्यैव ज्ञातृत्वाभ्युपगमे, अस्मदीयपक्ष एव परिगृहीतस्स्यात्।

**59.** And now let us turn to the knower involved in the knowledge that negates everything other than Brahman,

which is of the nature of pure consciousness. Is that knower the ego that emerges from the fictitious subject-object superimposition? That would be untenable, for that ego falls within the area of the object of negation and therefore cannot be the subject of negation. If it be said that the knower is Brahman itself, then the question arises whether that knowership of Brahman is real or superimposed. If it is superimposed, then this superimposition and the nescience at the bottom of the superimposition, remain falling outside the scope of the negating knowledge. If another means is posited for the negation of that superimposition and the nescience that is its basis, that means also must be knowlege and must therefore involve the three factors, knower, knowledge and the known. Further discussion about this new knowldge, which is inevitable, lands the argument in infinite regress. All knowledge, bereft of these three factors, loses the character of being knowledge. All knowledge is the apprehension of an object by a subject. Any knowledge that is not of this nature, would be incapable of eliminating nescience, even as the consciousness constitutive of Brahman's nature—being devoid of this nature—is not capable of eliminating illusion. If you admit that the non-phenomenal nature of Brahman itself is to be the knower, you are accepting our theory itself.

६०. निवर्तकज्ञानस्वरूपज्ञातृत्वं च स्वनिवर्त्यान्तर्गतम् इति वचनं भूतलव्यतिरिक्तं कृत्स्नं छिन्नं देवदत्तेन इत्यस्यामेव छेदनक्रियायाम् अस्याः छेदनक्रियायाः छेत्तृत्वस्य च छेद्यान्तर्भाववचनवत् उपहास्यम् ।

**60.** The proposition that the *knowledge* that eliminates nescience and its effects and the *knowership* of the knower in that knowledge are also included in the body of what is eliminated sounds ridiculous like the proposition that 'Everything other than the floor was cut by Devadatta and therefore in that process of cutting, the action of cutting, and the fact

of Devadatta being a cutter, were also included in the body of what was cut'.

६१. अपि च निखिलभेदनिवर्तकमिदमैक्यज्ञानं केन जातम् इति विवेचनीयम् । श्रुत्यैव इति चेत्, न । तस्याः ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तायाः अविद्यापरिकल्पितत्वात्, प्रपञ्चबाधकज्ञानोत्पादकत्वं न सम्भवति । तथा हि—दुष्टकारणजन्यमपि रज्जुसर्पज्ञानं, दुष्टकारणजन्येन "रज्जुरियं न सर्पः" इति ज्ञानेन न बाध्यते । रज्जुसर्पज्ञानभये वर्तमाने, केनचिद्भ्रान्तेन पुरुषेण, "रज्जुरियं न सर्पः" इत्युक्तेऽपि "अयं भ्रान्तः" इति ज्ञाने सति तद्वचनं रज्जुसर्पज्ञानस्य बाधकं न भवति, भयं च न निवर्तते; प्रयोजकज्ञानवतः श्रवणवेलायामेव हि ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तत्वेन श्रुतेरपि भ्रान्तिमूलत्वं ज्ञातम् इति ।

**61.** Now, what is the source of this knowledge of unity, which eliminates plurality? If it be answered that śruti is the source, there is a difficulty. Śruti is different from Brahman and like everything else different from Brahman, it is a fabrication of nescience and therefore cannot give rise to the knowledge that negates the world. To explain: The illusion of snake generated by the deficiencies of the perceptual system, cannot be cancelled, by another cognition of the form, 'This is a rope and not a snake', if that cognition owes its own origin to similar deficiencies of the perceptual system. When there is fear proceeding from the illusion of snake, the speech of another person, who is himself the victim of an illusion and who is known to be such a victim, even if he were to say, 'This is no snake, it is just a rope', can remove neither the first illusory cognition nor the fear born of it. This applies to the present case, because to the competent student at the very time of his learning the śruti, the śruti is known to be different from the pure Brahman and hence to be a production by illusion.

६२. किञ्च निवर्तकज्ञानस्य ज्ञातुः तत्सामग्रीभूतशास्त्रस्य च ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्ततया यदि बाध्यत्वमुच्यते, हन्त! तर्हि प्रपञ्चनिवृत्तेः मिथ्यात्वमाप-

ततीति प्रपञ्चस्य सत्यता स्यात्; स्वप्नदृष्टपुरुषवाक्यावगतपुत्रादिमरणस्य मिथ्यात्वेन पुत्रादिसत्यतावत् । किञ्च तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यं न प्रपञ्चस्य बाधकं, भ्रान्तिमूलत्वात् भ्रान्तप्रयुक्तरज्जुसर्पबाधकवाक्यवत् ।

**62.** It also follows as the knowledge that is to eliminate the cosmic illusion, the knower in that knowledge and the source of that knowledge, namely, the scriptures, are all different from Brahman and therefore liable to negation, the sublation of the world would be unreal and the world, the contradictory of the sublation, must be treated as real. The man seen in the dream may report one's son's death in the dream and his words being false, the son would be alive of necessity. And again, the passage like 'That thou art' are powerless to sublate the world, for they are products of illusion, just as the speech of the deluded man, known as such, seeking to correct the illusory cognition of the snake by another is powerless to effect the correction.

६३. ननु च स्वप्ने कस्मिश्चिद्भये वर्तमाने स्वप्नदशायामेव "अयं स्वप्नः" इति ज्ञाते सति, पूर्वभयनिवृत्तिः दृष्टा; तद्वदत्रापि सम्भवति इति चेत्; नैवम् —स्वप्नवेलायामेव, "सोऽपि स्वप्नः" इति ज्ञाते सति पुनर्भयानिवृत्तिरेव दृष्टेति न कश्चिद्विशेषः । श्रवणवेलायामेव "सोऽपि स्वप्नः" इति ज्ञातमेवेत्युक्तम् ।

**63.** 'But', it may be argued, 'supposing a man is experiencing some terror in a dream. The terror will surely disappear, if in the same dream, the dreamer were to get the knowledge that the terror-causing experience was a mere dream. Even so is the situation here'. The explanation cannot be sustained. If in the same dream one were to get a further knowledge that the knowledge that removed the terror was itself a dream, the original terror will return and continue. Thus the explanation does not improve the position. The basis of the objection is the fact that even

during the learning of the scriptures, it is being learnt by the student that the scriptures are also illusory like dreams.

६४. यदपि चेदमुक्तम्—भ्रान्तिपरिकल्पितत्वेन मिथ्यारूपमपि शास्त्रं "सत् . . . . . अद्वितीयं ब्रह्म" इति बोधयति । तस्य सतो ब्रह्मणो विषयस्य पश्चात्तनबाधादर्शनात् ब्रह्म सुस्थितमेव इति । तदयुक्तम् । "शून्यमेव तत्त्वम्" इति वाक्येन तस्यापि बाधितत्वात् । इदं भ्रान्तिमूलं वाक्यम् इति चेत्, "सत् अद्वितीयं ब्रह्म" इति वाक्यमपि भ्रान्तिमूलमिति त्वयैवोक्तम् । पश्चात्तनबाधादर्शनं तु सर्वशून्यवाक्यस्यैवेति विशेषः । सर्वशून्यवादिनः ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तवस्तुमिथ्यात्ववादिनश्च स्वपक्षसाधनप्रमाणपारमार्थ्यानभ्युपगमेन अभियुक्तैः वादानधिकार एव प्रतिपादितः — "अधिकारोऽनुपायत्वात् न वादे शून्यवादिनः" इति ।

**64.** A further point is made by you: Though the scriptures are fabrications of illusion and therefore unreal, the content of the scriptures, 'Pure Being', happening to be unsublated in later experience, they do impart the knowledge that 'Brahman is absolute existence, one without a second, (*Chā. VI, II*, 1)'. This is also illogical. The doctrine upholding 'sunya' (nothingness or the void) as the ultimate, furnishes the sublation of the content of the scriptures as described by you. You cannot urge that the doctrine of 'sunya' originates from error, for the sacred texts also like, 'Brahman is absolute existence, one without a second' are products of error according to your own view. The distinction lies in the fact that only the assertion of 'sunya' is free from subsequent sublation. The upholders of the doctrine of 'sunya' and those who deny the reality of everything other than Brahman have no right to philosophy; for they both refuse to admit the reality of the sources of knowledge, on which, they base their systems. This has been pointed out by the revered teachers: 'The philosophers of "śūnya" have no right to dialectics, because they have no means of knowledge.'

६५. अपि च प्रत्यक्षदृष्टस्य प्रपञ्चस्य मिथ्यात्वं केन प्रमाणेन साध्यते? प्रत्यक्षस्य दोषमूलत्वेन अन्यथासिद्धिसम्भवात्, निर्दोषं शास्त्रमनन्यथासिद्धं प्रत्यक्षस्य बाधकम् इति चेत् केन दोषेण जातं प्रत्यक्षम् अनन्तभेदविषयम् इति वक्तव्यम्। अनादिभेदवासनाख्यदोषजातं प्रत्यक्षम् इति चेत्, हन्त! तर्हि अनेनैव दोषेण जातं शास्त्रमपीति, एकदोषमूलत्वात् शास्त्रप्रत्यक्षयोः न बाध्यबाधकभावसिद्धिः।

**65.** By what means of knowledge is it established that the world revealed by perception is unreal? If it is contended that perception is tainted by a defective origin and that its deliverances can be accounted for without admitting their truth, while the sacred scripture is flawless in origin and its deliverances cannot be accounted for except by the admission of their truth and therefore scriptural knowledge can sublate perception, it is necessary for the completion of the argument to specify the exact defect that falsifies perceptual experience which presents to us the world of measureless multiplicity. You describe the defect as the beginningless pluralistic predilction. But alas! the sacred scripture also, on your hypothesis, suffers from the same defect. Since the radical defect is common, it is impossible that one of the two, scripture and perception, can bring about the sublation of the other.

६६. आकाशवाय्वादिभूत-तदारब्धशब्दस्पर्शादियुक्त-मनुष्यत्वादिसंस्थान-संस्थितपदार्थग्राहि प्रत्यक्षम्; शास्त्रं तु प्रत्यक्षाद्यपरिच्छेद्यसर्वान्तरात्मत्वाद्यनन्तविशेषणविशिष्टब्रह्मस्वरूप-तदुपासनाद्याराधनप्रकार-तत्प्राप्तिपूर्वक-तत्प्रसादलभ्यफलविशेष-तदनिष्टकरणमूलनिग्रहविशेषविषयम् इति शास्त्रप्रत्यक्षयोः न विरोधः।

**66.** Our own method of adjusting the claims of these sources of knowledge is free from these inconsistencies. Perception is the apprehension of elements like ether and air and their products possessing properties like touch and sound

and existing in forms like that of men, animals and other objects. The theme of scriptures comprehends principles not determinable by perception. They are the nature of Brahman, characterized by infinite attributes, like omniscience, the pervasive immanence in all as their ultimate self and absolute reality, the various modes of worship of Brahman like devout meditation, the attainment of Brahman and the attainment of the *summum bonum*, following that meditation and issuing out of the grace of Brahmna and the particular methods of suppressing and eliminating the root of all evil, which consists in going contrary to Brahman.

६७. अनादिनिधनाविच्छिन्नपाठसम्प्रदायताद्यनेकगुणविशिष्टस्य शास्त्रस्य बलीयस्त्वं वदता प्रत्यक्षपारमार्थ्यमवश्यमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् इति, अलमनेन श्रुतिशतवितत्तिवातवेगपराहतकुदृष्टिदुष्टयुक्तिजालतूलनिरसनेन इत्युपरम्यते ।

**67.** The thinkers who hold that the scripture is superior to other means of knowledge, on the ground of innumerable excellences like its enjoying unbroken continuity of tradition, without beginning and end are obliged, logically, to admit the veracity of perception. The theory under discussion is inherently weak, being a vicious view proceeding from unsound logic. It is further assailed by hundreds of Vedic declarations. As its critical examination conducted so far is quite ample, we conclude its refutation.

६८. द्वितीये तु पक्षे उपाधिब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तवस्त्वन्तरानभ्युपगमात्, ब्रह्मण्येव उपाधिसंसर्गात् औपाधिकास्सर्वे दोषाः ब्रह्मण्येव भवेयुः । ततश्च अपहतपाप्मत्वादिर्निर्दोषश्रुतयस्सर्वा विहन्यन्ते ।

**68.** The second view admits no entities besides Brahman and the limiting adjunct. Hence the limiting adjunct must operate on Brahman itself. All the imperfection arising out of the operation of the limiting adjunct must affect Brahman itself, as they arise within it. In consequence, the texts

speaking of Brahman being free from sin and other imperfections, get nullified.

६९. यथा घटाकाशादेः परिच्छिन्नतया महाकाशाद्वैलक्षण्यं, परस्परभेदश्च दृश्यते, तत्रस्था दोषा वा गुणा वा अनवछिन्ने महाकाशे न सम्बध्यते, एवम् उपाधिकृतभेदव्यवस्थितजीवगताः दोषाः अनुपहिते परे ब्रह्मणि न सम्बध्यन्ते इति चेत्, नैतदुपपद्यते । निरवयवस्य आकाशस्य अनवच्छेद्यस्य घटादिभिः छेदासम्भवात्, तेनैवाकाशेन घटादयस्संयुक्ता इति, ब्रह्मणोऽप्यच्छेद्यत्वात् ब्रह्मैव उपाधिसंयुक्तं स्यात् ।

**69. (Objection):** It may be argued that the universal space is different from space conditioned by a jar, because the latter is limited. There is thus a difference between universal space and the limited space contained in a jar. The merits or defects pertaining to the limited space do not affect the iniversal space. Even so is the case in the present context. The imperfections belong to the individual self, whose distinction from all else is determined by the limiting adjunct. The unconditioned Brahman is free from these imperfections.

**(Reply):** We answer that the explanation is not correct. Space being partless and non-composite, cannot be divided. The limiting conditions like the jar cannot break it up into parts. Therefore the universal space itself is in conjunction with the conditions like the jar. Similarly Brahman being invisible, the limiting conditions must condition Brahman itself.

७०. घटसंयुक्ताकाशप्रदेशः अन्यस्मादाकाशप्रदेशाद्भिद्यते इति चेत्, आकाशस्यैकस्यैव प्रदेशभेदेन घटादिसंयोगात् घटादौ गच्छति तस्य च प्रदेशस्य अनियम इति; तद्वत् ब्रह्मण्येव प्रदेशभेदानियमेन उपाधिसंसर्गात्, उपाधौ गच्छति संयुक्तवियुक्तब्रह्मप्रदेशभेदाच्च ब्रह्मण्येव उपाधिसंसर्गः क्षणे क्षणे बन्धो मोक्षश्च भवतीति सन्तः परिहसन्ति ।

**70.** If you maintain that the part of space conditioned by the jar is distinct from other parts of space, a fresh difficulty crops up. The universal space is one and the jar is not fixed to any one part of it. If the jar is moved, it conditions different parts of space at successive moments without any fixities of conjunction to or separation from any part of space. On the same principle, the limiting machinery, the cause of bondage, when in motion must come in conjunction with different parts of Brahman without any fixity of association. These parts are *ex-hypothesi* mutually distinct. The upshot of this is the implication that the limiting condtion is actually in conjunction with Brahman invariably, not with any particular part thereof and that every moment, when the limiting physical machinery of the body is in motion, there must be sponteneous release and bondage respectively for the part of Brahman from which the machinery moves and the part of Brahman to which it moves.

७१. निरवयवस्याकाशस्यैव श्रोत्रेन्द्रियत्वेऽपि इन्द्रियव्यवस्थावत् ब्रह्मण्यपि व्यवस्था उपपद्यते इति चेत्, न । वायुविशेषसंस्कृतकर्णप्रदेशसंयुक्तस्यैव आकाशप्रदेशस्य इन्द्रियत्वात् । तस्य च प्रदेशान्तराद्भेदानियमेऽपि इन्द्रियव्यवस्था उपपद्यते । आकाशस्य तु सर्वेषां शरीरेषु गच्छत्सु अनियमेन सर्वप्रदेशसंयोगः, इति ब्रह्मण्यपि उपाधिसंयोगप्रदेशानियम एव ।

**71.** **(Objection):** The impartite space itself is the organ of hearing; but still the organ of hearing is a well-determined part of space and not the whole space indefinitely. On the same principle the phenomenon of individuation can be explained.

**(Reply):** If this be said, we do not accept the explanation. Space by itself is not the organ of hearing. Only that part of space, which is conjoined with the region of the ear which is influenced by a particular kind of air, constitutes the organ of hearing. Even if there is no fixity of conjunction

between any part of space and the region of the ear, there is no difficulty in accounting for the location of the organ of hearing in a particular part of space. Just as space, without any fixity of points of contact, comes in conjunction with the moving organisms, Brahman's parts also must be conceived as coming in conjunction with the moving limiting adjuncts without any definiteness and fixity of one-to one conjunction.

७२. आकाशस्य स्वरूपेणैव श्रोत्रेन्द्रियत्वमभ्युपगम्यापि इन्द्रयव्यवस्था उक्ता । परमार्थतस्तु आकाशो न श्रोत्रेन्द्रियम् । "वैकारिकादहङ्कारात् एकादश इन्द्रियाणि जायन्ते" इति हि वैदिकाः । यथोक्तं भगवता पराशरेण "तैजसानि इन्द्रियाण्याहुः, देवा वैकारिका दश, एकादशं मनश्चात्र, देवा वैकारिकास्स्मृताः" इति । अयमर्थः—वैकारिकः तैजसः भूतादिः इति त्रिविधोऽहङ्कारः । स च क्रमात् सात्विकः राजसः तामसश्च । तत्र "तामसाद्भूतादेः आकाशादीनि भूतानि जायन्ते" इति सृष्टिक्रममुक्त्वा' "तैजसात् राजसाहङ्कारात् एकादश इन्द्रियाणि जायन्ते" इति परमतमुपन्यस्य, "सात्विकाहङ्कारात् वैकारिकाणि इन्द्रियाणि जायन्ते" इति स्वमतमुच्यते देवा वैकारिकास्स्मृताः इति । देवाः इन्द्रियाणि । एवम् आहङ्कारिकाणामिन्द्रियाणां, भूतैश्चाप्यायनं महाभारते उच्यते ।

**72.** The phenomenon of specific location of the organ of hearing in space has been explained, assuming for the sake of the argument, the theory that space becomes the organ of hearing. But, as a matter of fact, space (or ether) does not constitute the organ of hearing. The Vedic view is that the eleven senses are the products of the vaikārika (sāttvika) ahaṅkāra. It has been so enunciated by Bhagavān Parāśara: 'Some say that the senses are taijasa (products of rājasika ahaṅkāra). But in reality, the ten senses and the mind, the eleventh sense, are vaikārika'. The meaning of the verse is as follows: There are three kinds of ahaṅkāras—vaikārika,

taijasa and bhūtādi. They are sāttvika, rājasa and tāmasa respectively. Elements like space (ākāśa) are produced by bhūtādi ahaṅkāra in the order of creation. A *prima facie* view holds that the eleven senses are produced by taijasa. But the correct view, upheld by the author, is that the eleven senses are products of vaikārika ahaṅkāra. By the term 'devas' in the text the senses are meant. That the senses, which are the products of the vaikārika ahaṅkāra, are satisfied and nourished by the elements like ākāśa (and are not produced by them) is laid down in the *Mahābhārata*.

७३. भौतिकत्वेऽपि इन्द्रियाणाम् आकाशादिभूतविकारत्वादेव आकाशादिभूतपरिणामविशेषाः व्यवस्थिता एव, शरीरवत् पुरुषाणामिन्द्रियाणि भवन्ति इति; ब्रह्मणि अच्छेद्ये निरवयवे निर्विकारे तु अनियमेन अनन्तहेयोपाधिसंसर्गदोषो दुष्परिहार एव इति; श्रद्दधानानामेव अयं पक्ष इति शास्त्रविदो न बहुमन्यन्ते ।

**73.** Even if the senses are the products of the elements, there is no difficulty in accounting for the determinate localization of the senses, just as there is no difficulty with regard to bodies, also products of the elements. But Brahman indivisible, non-composite and changeless, becomes, on this theory, subject to the evil of conjunction with an infinite number of limiting conditions without any determinate localization of effects. There is no way of escaping this consequence. The theory is only for the consumption of the believers and can withstand no open-minded inquiry. The wise, learned in the philosophical sciences, do not have any esteem for it.

७४. स्वरूपपरिणामाभ्युपगमात् अविकारश्रुतिः बाध्यते निरवद्यता च ब्रह्मणः । शक्तिपरिणाम इति चेत्, केयं शक्तिरित्युच्यते? किं ब्रह्मपरिणामरूपा उत ब्रह्मणोऽनन्या काऽपि इति; उभयपक्षेऽपि स्वरूपपरिणामः अवर्जनीय एव ।

**74.** This school admits that the substantive nature of Brahman is liable to mutation. The Vedic affirmations of the immutability and perfections of the ultimate are thereby negated. If it be said that only the śakti or power of Brahman undergoes change, we ask what this śakti is. Is śakti a modification of Brahman? Or is it something indefinable but not different from Brahman? Both these definitions would inevitably imply the mutability of Brahman in its substantive nature.

७५. तृतीयेऽपि पक्षे जीवब्रह्मणोः भेदवदभेदस्य चाभ्युपगमात् तस्य च तद्भावात् सौभरिभेदवत् स्वावतारभेदवच्च सर्वस्य ईश्वरभेदत्वात् सर्वे जीवगता दोषाः तस्यैव स्युः । एतदुक्तं भवति — ईश्वरः स्वरूपेणैव सुर-नरतिर्यक्-स्थावरादिभेदेन अवस्थितः इति हि तदात्मकत्ववर्णनं क्रियते । तथा सति एकमृत्पिण्डारब्धघटशरावादिगतान्युदकाहरणादीनि सर्वकार्याणि यथा तस्यैव भवन्ति, एवं सर्वजीवगतसुखदुःखादि सर्वम् ईश्वरगतमेव स्यात् इति ।

**75.** The third standpoint also maintains that there is both identity and difference between Brahman and the jīva. The position is similar to that of the sage Saubhari, said to have been embodied in several bodies simultaneously. It is also similar to that of God in relation to his multiplicity of incarnations. In that case, the evils attaching to the individual selves would affect the supreme Self itself. The explanation of the school is that God himself, in his own essential nature exists as the individual selves of the various species—gods, men, animals and plants and so on. Thus is the universal selfhood of God explained. But the various uses to which the many products of one lump of clay are put are really the uses of clay-substance itself. In the same way the joys and sorrows that happen to individual selves would all be joys and sorrows of God himself.

७६. घटकरकादिसंस्थानानुपयुक्तमृद्द्रव्यं यथा कार्यान्तरानन्वितम्, एवमेव सुर-पशु-मनुजादिजीवत्वानुपयुक्तेश्वरः सर्वज्ञः सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वादिगुणाकर इति

चेत्, सत्यम् । स एव ईश्वरः एकेनांशेन कल्याणगुणाकरः, स एव च अन्येनांशेन हेयगुणाकरः इत्युक्तं, द्वयोरंशयोः ईश्वरत्वाविशेषात् ।

**76.** **(Objection):** That part of the substance, clay, which has not been used for making any of the articles like jar, remains unconnected with the effects of those products of clay. In the same way the part of God not involved in the formation of the individual selves like those of gods and men, remains in his uncompromising majesty, omniscient and full of auspicious attributes like having his will always fulfilled.

**(Reply):** We admit your explanation and urge the consequence of that explanation, that the same God is full of perfection in one part of his being and in another part he is equally full of imperfections. Both are equally parts of God.

७७. द्वावंशौ व्यवस्थितौ इति चेत्, कस्तेन लाभः? एकस्यैव एकेनांशेन नित्यदुःखित्वात् अंशान्तरेण सुखित्वमपि न ईश्वरत्वाय कल्पते । यथा देवदत्तस्य एकस्मिन् हस्ते चन्दनपङ्कानुलेपः केयूरकटकाङ्गुलीयकालङ्कारः, एतस्यैवान्यस्मिन् हस्ते मुद्गराभिघातः कालानलज्वालानुप्रवेशश्च, तद्वदेव ईश्वरस्य स्यात् इति, ब्रह्माज्ञानपक्षादपि पापीयानयं भेदाभेदपक्षः, अपरिमित दुःखस्य पारमार्थिकत्वात् संसारिणामनन्तत्वेन दुस्तरत्वाच्च ।

**77.** If you say that the two parts of God are distinct and that there is no overlapping, we ask, 'What is the gain thereby?' When the same person is eternally miserable in one part, his being happy in a different part, cannot raise him to the status of the supreme Godhead. Suppose one, Devadatta, has one of his arms bedecked with superfine jewels and perfumed and annointed with sandal paste, while the other arm is hammered and placed in deadly flames. Such is the predicament of God in this theory. In the final estimate, this theory of identity and difference is more unholy than even the view that ascribes nescience to Brahman; for the unlimited sorrow of transmigratory existence is taken as real and that

transmigratory existence will never cease as an infinite number of individual selves are posited.

७८. तस्मात् विलक्षणोऽयं जीवांश: इति चेत, आगतोऽसि तर्हि मदीयं पन्थानम् । ईश्वरस्य स्वरूपेण तादात्म्यवर्णने स्यादयं दोष: । आत्मशरीर-भावेन तु तादात्म्यप्रतिपादने न कश्चिद्दोष: । प्रत्युत निखिलभुवननियमनादि: महान् गुणगण: प्रतिपादितो भवति । सामानाधिकरण्यं च मुख्यवृत्तम् ।

**78.** If you were to say that the jīva-part is different from the other part which is God, you are adopting our own way of thought. This error results from your taking the identity taught in the Upaniṣads as identity of essential substance. If that identity is interpreted in terms of the relation of body and soul, between the individual self and the supreme Spirit, there is absolutely no error. Not merely is there no error, but there is also the merit of fully elucidating the great attributes of God involved in his sustaining the entire universe as its Ruler. And further, the passages embodying co-ordinate predication are taken in their direct and primary import.

७९. अपि च एकस्य वस्तुनो हि भिन्नाभिन्नत्वं विरुद्धत्वात् न सम्भवतीति उक्तम् । घटस्य पटाद्भिन्नत्वे सति तस्य तस्मिन्नभाव: । अभिन्नत्वे सति तस्य च भाव: इति एकस्मिन् काले च एकस्मिन् देशे च एकस्य हि पदार्थस्य युगपत् सद्भाव: असद्भावश्च विरुद्ध: । जात्यात्मना भाव:, व्यक्त्यात्मना च अभाव: इति चेत्, जाते: मुण्डेन व्यक्त्या चाभेदे सति, खण्डे मुण्डस्यापि सद्भावप्रसङ्ग: । खण्डेन च जातेरभिन्नत्वे सद्भाव:, भिन्नत्वे असद्भाव:, अश्वे महिषत्वस्यैवेति विरोधो दुष्परिहर एव ।

**79.** Further, an entity cannot have, as already stated identity-cum-difference because of the essential self-contradictoriness of such a character. If a jar is different from a piece of cloth, it means that the piece of cloth does not exist in the jar. If it is identical with it, the piece of cloth must

exist in the jar. Such being the nature of the case, the same entity, at the same time, in the same point of space, being the locus of both the existence and non-existence of another entity, is a sheer contradiction. It is said that the two entities are one by virtue of the same universal inherent in both of them and different by virtue of their individuality, as individuals. Even on that supposition the contradiction is not removed. If the universal 'cowness' is identical with the individual cows like the one without horns and the one with broken horns, then the cow without horns must be one with the cow with broken horns. And again, if the universal 'cowness' is both identical with and different from the individuals, contradiction is inevitable, for, in so far as the universal is the same as the individuals, the cow with broken horns and the one without horns must be one and the same and in so far as the universal is different from the individuals, the two must be different like a horse and a buffalo.

८०. जात्यादेः वस्तुसंस्थानतया वस्तुनः प्रकारत्वात्, प्रकारप्रकारिणोश्च पदार्थान्तरत्वं, प्रकारस्य पृथक्सिद्ध्यनर्हत्वं, पृथगनुपलम्भश्च, तस्य च संस्थानस्य च अनेकवस्तुषु प्रकारतया अवस्थितिश्च इत्यादि पूर्वमेवोक्तम् । "सोऽयम्" इति बुद्धिः प्रकारैक्यात्, "अयमपि दण्डी" इति बुद्धिवत् । अयमेव च जात्यादिः प्रकारो वस्तुनो भेद इत्युच्यते, तद्योग एव वस्तु भिन्नम् इति व्यवहारहेतुरित्यर्थः । स च वस्तुनो भेदव्यवहारहेतुः स्वस्य च, संवेदनवत्; यथा संवेदनं वस्तुनो व्यवहारहेतुः, स्वस्य व्यवहारहेतुश्च भवति । अत एव सन्मात्रग्राहिप्रत्यक्षं न भेदग्राहि इत्यादिवादा निरस्ताः, जात्यादिसंस्थितस्यैव वस्तुनः प्रत्यक्षेण गृहीतत्वात्, तस्यैव संस्थानरूपजात्यादेः प्रतियोग्यपेक्षया भेदव्यवहारहेतुत्वाच्च । स्वरूपपरिणामदोषश्च पूर्वमेवोक्तः ।

**80.** Features of objects like the universal are the configurations of those objects and their modes. The objects and their modes are distinct as categories, and the mode does not exist apart from the object of which it is the mode. Nor

is the mode cognized independent of the object. The configuration is inherent in several objects as their mode. These are considerations already enunciated. When we judge of any entity as 'This is that one', the sameness of the mode characterizing many objects is the basis, as in the judgement, 'This one is also a person holding a staff'. The mode of a substance consisting of features like the universal is described as the distinguishing character of the substance. It is the possession of such a mode that furnishes the ground for the proposition, 'This object is different'. Such a mode, supplying the ground for differentiating the entity in which it inheres from other entities, differentiates itself also from all else. It is capable of this twofold function of differentiation, just as consciousness is revelatory of the objects of consciousness and is also self-revelatory. It is for this reason that theories holding that 'perception is the apprehension of pure being and perception is not the apprehension of difference' stand refuted. They are untenable because in perception there is the apprehension of an entity only as characterized by its configuration consisting of features like its universal and the same configuration becomes the ground of the subsequent differentiation of the entity from others on the part of the cognizer in the light of his subsequent acquaintance with other entities. The error of imputing mutation to the substantive nature of Brahman has already been exposed.

८१. "यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन् पृथिव्या अन्तरो यं पृथिवी न वेद यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं यः पृथिवीमन्तरो यमयति एष त आत्माऽन्तर्याम्यमृतः" "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरं य आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्माऽन्तर्याम्यमृतः", "यः पृथिवीमन्तरे सञ्चरन् यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं, यं पृथिवी न वेद" इत्यादि, "योऽक्षरमन्तरे सञ्चरन् यस्याक्षरं शरीरं यमक्षरं न वेद यो मृत्युमन्तरे सञ्चरन् यस्य,

मृत्युश्शरीरं यं मृत्युर्न वेद एष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मापहतपाप्मा दिव्यो देव एको नारायणः", "द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्यो अभिचाकशीति", "अन्तः प्रविष्टश्शास्ता जनानां सर्वात्मा", "तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत् तदनुप्रविश्य सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्" इत्यादि, "सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत्", "अनेन जीवेनात्मना" इत्यादि, "पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा जुष्टस्ततस्तेनामृतत्वमेति", "भोक्ता भोग्यं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा सर्वं प्रोक्तं त्रिविधं ब्रह्म एतत्", "नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानामेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामात्", "प्रधानक्षेत्रज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः", "ज्ञाज्ञौ ते द्वावजावीशनीशौ" इत्यादिश्रुतिशतैः, तदुपबृंहणैः "जगत्सर्वं शरीरं ते स्थैर्यं ते वसुधातलम्", "यत्किञ्चित्सृज्यते येन सत्त्वजातेन वै द्विज । तस्य सृज्यस्य सम्भूतौ तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः ॥", "अहमात्मा गुडाकेश सर्वभूताशयस्थितः", "सर्वस्य चाहं हृदि सन्निविस्टो मत्तस्मृतिर्ज्ञानमपोहनं च" इत्यादिवेदविदग्रेसरवाल्मीकि - पराशर - द्वैपायनवचोभिश्च, परस्य ब्रह्मणः सर्वस्य आत्मत्वावगमात्, चिदचिदात्मकस्य वस्तुनः तच्छरीरत्वावगमाच्च, शरीरस्य च शरीरिणं प्रति प्रकारतयैव पदार्थत्वात्, शरीरशरीरिणोश्च धर्मभेदेऽपि तयोरसङ्करात्, सर्वशरीरं ब्रह्मेति ब्रह्मणो वैभवं प्रतिपादयद्भिः सामानाधिकरण्यादिभिः मुख्यवृत्तैः सर्वचेतनाचेतनप्रकारं ब्रह्मैव अभिधीयते ।

**81.** 'He, who dwells in the earth, who is in the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is and who rules the earth from within, he is thy ātman, the inner controller immortal (*Bṛ. V, VII,* 3)', 'He who dwells in the self, who is in the self, whom the self does not know, whose body the self is and who rules the self from within, he is thy ātman, the inner controller the immortal (*Mādhya, V, VII,* 22). 'He who moves within the earth, whose body the earth is, whom the earth does not know' etc. and 'He who moves within the imperishable, whose body the imperishable is, whom the imperishable does not know, he who moves within

death, whose body death is, whom death does not know, he is the inner Self of all beings, free from all imperfections, the Divine, the sole God, Nārāyaṇa (*Su.* 7)', 'There are two birds always together, two friends; they live on the same tree; of them, one tastes sweet *pippala* fruit and the other not eating, shines (*Mu. III, I,* 1)', 'The Self of all, who has entered into all, the Lord of all created beings (*Ā. III,* 21)', 'Having created that, it entered into it, having entered it, it became the living and the non-living;....aye! having become the real and the unreal, it remained the real (*Tai. II,* 6)', 'Entering, as this ātman, the jīva....(*Chā. VI, III,* 2)', 'Comprehending the Self and the directing Supreme, as different, he gains the grace of the Supreme and attains immortality (*Śve. I,* 12)', 'Having comprehended the experiencer of pleasures and pains, the objects of his experience and the directing Supreme, the whole of this threefold Brahman is described by me (*Śve. I,* 25)', 'The one eternal Spirit who fulfils the desires of the many eternal selves (*Śve. II, V,* 13)', 'He is the Master of primordial nature and of the individual selves. He is the Lord of qualities (*Śve. VI,* 33)', 'There are two unborn ones, one of them is ignorant and the other knows, one is the Lord and the other is the ruled (*Śve. I,* 17)'; such śruti texts abound in hundreds. There are supporting supplementary texts also with the same purport: 'The whole universe is thy body; your stability has become the earth (*Rā. VI, CXX,* 26)', 'In all cases of creation, whatever may be the created being and whoever may be the creator, ultimately all that is responsible for the creation is the body of Hari (*Vi. I, XX,* 38)', 'I am the ātman, O Arjuna, as dwelling in the hearts of all (*Gītā, X,* 20)', 'I am established in the hearts of all. From me emanate remembrance, knowledge and ratiocination (*Gītā, XV,* 15)'; such are the words of the sages, like Vālmīki, Parāśara and Dvaipāyana, who are the best among the knowers of the Vedas. From both the Vedas and the words

of the sages, emerges the following teaching: The supreme Brahman is the self of all. The sentient and non-sentient entities constitute its body. The body is an entity and has being only by virtue of its being the mode of the soul of which it is the body. The body and soul, though characterized by different attributes do not get mixed up. From all this follows the central teaching that Brahman, with all the non-sentient and sentient entities as its modes, is the ultimate. The scriptures declare this glory of Brahman by saying that Brahman has the whole univerce as its body. They also identify Branman and the world in the manner of co-ordinate predication, which bears in this connection direct and primary meaning.

८२. सामानाधिकरण्यं हि द्वयोः पदयोः प्रकारद्वयमुखेन एकार्थनिष्ठत्वम्। तस्य च एतस्मिन् पक्षे मुख्यता। तथा हि—"तत् त्वम्" इति सामानाधिकरण्ये 'तत्" इत्यनेन जगत्कारणं सर्वकल्याणगुणाकरं निरवद्यं ब्रह्मोच्यते। "त्वम्" इति च चेतनसमानाधिकरणवृत्तेन जीवान्तर्यामिरूपि, तच्छरीरं तदात्मतया अवस्थितं, तत्प्रकारं ब्रह्मोच्यते। इतरेषु पक्षेषु सामानाधिकरण्यहानिः ब्रह्मणः सदोषता च स्यात्।

**82.** Co-ordinate predication is the application of two terms to a single entity through connotation of its two modes. On our view co-ordinate predication is given its straight and primary significance. To explain: In the passage affirming identity 'That thou art', the term 'that' signifies Brahman, as the cause of the world, as the abode of all perfections. By the term 'thou' also, denotative of the individual self, Brahman itself is signified as the inner ruler of the jīva, as possessed of it as its body, as existing within the jīva as its self and as possessing the jiva as its mode. On all other theories, two glaring errors ensue, namely, that of giving up the governing principle of co-ordination and of ascribing evil to Brahman itself.

८३. एतदुक्तं भवति — "ब्रह्मैव एवमवस्थितम्" इत्यत्र "एव" शब्दार्थभूतप्रकारतयैव विचित्रचेतनाचेतनात्मकप्रपञ्चस्य स्थूलस्य सूक्ष्मस्य च सद्भावः । तथा च "बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति अयमर्थः सम्पन्नो भवति । तस्यैव ईश्वरस्य कार्यतया कारणतया च नानासंस्थानसंस्थितस्य संस्थानतया चिदचिद्वस्तुजातमवस्थितमिति ।

**83.** When we say, 'Brahman exists thus', the term '*thus*' signifies the mode in which the subject, Brahman, exists. Now the universe of sentient and non-sentient entities, in both its gross and subtle states, forms the meaning of the term '*thus*' as it forms the mode of Brahman. It is only from this standpoint that the passage, 'Let me become many, let me grow forth (*Chā. VI, II*, 3)' becomes meaningful. Īśvara exists as the cause and as the effect, assuming diversity of forms. The sentient and non-sentient entities constitute those forms.

८४. ननु च संस्थानरूपेण प्रकारतया "एवं"-शब्दार्थत्वं जातिगुणयोरेव दृष्टं, न द्रव्यस्य । स्वतन्त्रसिद्धयोग्यस्य पदार्थस्य एवंशब्दार्थतया ईश्वरस्य प्रकारमात्रत्वमयुक्तं इति चेत् उच्यते । द्रव्यस्यापि दण्डकुण्डलादेः द्रव्यान्तर-प्रकारत्वं दृष्टमेव ।

**84.** (**Objection**): 'But only the generic character (universal) and attributes are seen to be modes of things and to constitute the meaning of the term 'thus'. No substance ever becomes such a mode and the meaning of the term 'thus'. Therefore, substances, capable of independent existence, cannot be the meaning of the term 'thus' in relation to Īśvara; nor can they be his modes'.

(**Reply**): Even substances like a staff or ear-ring can become modes of other substances as implied in terms 'daṇḍin' and 'kuṇḍalin' (man holding a staff and man wearing ear-rings).

८५. ननु च दण्डादेः स्वतन्त्रस्य द्रव्यान्तरप्रकारत्वे मत्वर्थीयप्रत्ययो दृष्टः, यथा — दण्डी कुण्डली इति । अतः गोत्वादितुल्यतया चेतनाचेतनस्य

द्रव्यभूतस्य वस्तुनः ईश्वरप्रकारतया सामानाधिकरण्येन प्रतिपादनं न युज्यते । अत्रोच्यते—गौरश्वो मनुष्यो देव इति, भूतसङ्घातरूपाणां द्रव्याणामेव "देवदत्तो मनुष्यो जातः पुण्यविशेषेण", "यज्ञदत्तो गौर्जातः पापेन कर्मणा", "अन्यश्चेतनः पुण्यातिरेकेण देवो जातः" इत्यादि देवादिशरीराणां, चेतन-प्रकारतया लोकवेदयोः सामानाधिकरण्येन प्रतिपादनं दृष्टम् ।

**85. (Objection):** The cases instanced are different from the one undeı consideration. When a substance itself is a mode of another substance, an affix indicative of possession is used (indicative of the meaning of 'having') as in the examples of staff-bearer and ear-ıing-wearer. Therefore the individual selves and physical entities, being substances, cannot be mere modes of Īśvara, like 'cowness' in relation to a cow and the terms standing for them cannot signify God (without the aforesaid affix) as it is contended.

**(Reply):** The terms, cow, horse, man and god signify substances, brought about by specific combination of basic material elements. They are materıal products and substances. So both in empirical usage and Vedic usage, the terms used for them are put in apposition with terms representing the souls embodied in them, as they are just modes of those individual selves. We say, 'Devadatta, owing to particular merit is born a man, Yajñadatta, owing to sinful actions in the past, is born a cow, another soul, owing to excessive merit, is born a god'. Thus the bodies being the modes of the souls, the terms representing the bodies are equated with those signifying the souls and are treated as standing for the souls themselves.

८६. अयमर्थः—जातिर्वा द्रव्यं वा गुणो वा न तत्र आदरः । कञ्चन द्रव्यविशेषं प्रति विशेषणतयैव यस्य सद्भावः, तस्य तदपृथक्सिद्धेः तत्प्रकारतया तत्सामानाधिकरण्येन प्रतिपादनं युक्तम् । यस्य पुनः द्रव्यस्य पृथक्सिद्धस्यैव कदाचित् क्वचित् द्रव्यान्तरप्रकारत्वमिष्यते, तत्र मत्वर्थीयप्रत्ययः इति

विशेषः । एवमेव स्थावरजङ्गमात्मकस्य सर्वस्य वस्तुनः ईश्वरशरीरत्वेन तत्प्रकारतयैव स्वरूपसद्भाव इति, तत्प्रकारी ईश्वर एव तत्तच्छब्देन अभिधीयत इति, तत्सामानाधिकरण्येन प्रतिपादनं युक्तम् । तदेतत् पूर्वमेव नामरूपव्याकरणश्रुतिविवरणे प्रपञ्चितम् ।

**86.** The central principle is this: Whatever exists only as an attribute of a substance—be it a generic character or a quality or a substance itself, there being no speciality attached to any category in this matter—that being inseparable from that substance, as its mode only, can be designated as one with that substance. But if a substance, capable of independent being, comes to from a mode of another substance contingently at only some points of space and time, the term signifying the modal substance can signify the basic substance through the use of the possessive affix. Thus all substances, sentient and non-sentient, have reality and being only as constituting the body and thus as forming the modes of Īśvara. Īśvara, having them as his mode, is designated by the terms denotative of them. Thus the co-ordinate propositions are quite appropriate. All this has been already expounded in the course of the interpretation of the passage dealing with the differentiation of names and forms.

८७. अतः प्रकृतिपुरुषमहदहङ्कारतन्मात्रभूतेन्द्रियतदारब्धचतुर्दशभुवनात्मकब्रह्माण्ड-तदन्तर्वर्ति-देवतिर्यङ्मनुष्यस्थावरादिसर्वप्रकारसंस्थानसंस्थितं कार्यमपि सर्वं ब्रह्मैव इति, कारणभूतब्रह्मविज्ञानादेव सर्वं विज्ञातं भवतीति, एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानम् उपपन्नतरम् । तदेवं कार्यकारणभावादिमुखेन कृत्स्नस्य चिदचिद्वस्तुनः परब्रह्मप्रकारतया तदात्मकत्वम् उक्तम् ।

**87.** Therefore, Brahman itself is the effect as it exists having for its mode the configurations consisting of prakṛti, individual selves, mahat, ahaṅkāra, tanmātra, elements, senses and the product of these, the cosmic sphere of Brahma, made up of the fourteen worlds, and the varied forms of

being like gods, men and animals, and plants. The knowledge of Brahman in its causal state leads to the knowledge of all. The idea of the knowledge of the 'one' leading to the knowledge of all, becomes, thereby, perfectly intelligible. Through a consideration of the principles like causation, the great truth that Brahman is the self of all, as all sentient and non-sentient entities are its modes, is propounded.

८८. ननु च परस्य ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपेण परिणामास्पदत्वं निर्विकारनिरवद्य-श्रुतिव्याकोपप्रसङ्गेन निवारितम् । "प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्" इति एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञामृत्-तत्कार्यदृष्टान्ताभ्यां, परमपुरुषस्य जगदुपादानकारणत्वं च प्रतिपादितम्; उपादानकारणत्वं च परिणामास्पदत्व-मेव; कथमिदमुपपद्यते ?

**88.** **(Objection)**: It has been maintained by you that highest Brahman is not subject to modification in its substantive nature; otherwise the sacred texts proclaiming that highest Brahman as changeless and flawless are contradicted. In the same breath, it is maintained by you that the Supreme person is the material cause of the universe in accordance with the aphorism, 'It is the material cause, on account of the opening declaration and the illustrations cited (*Bra. I, IV*, 24)', on the authority of the Upaniṣad declaration of one knowledge leading to all knowledge and the illustrations of clay and its products etc., cited. To be a material cause is to be subject to modification. How can these two conflicting assertion be both true?

८९. अत्रोच्यते—सजीवस्य प्रपञ्चस्य अविशेषेण कारणमुक्तम् । तत्र ईश्वरस्य जीवरूपपरिणामाभ्युपगमे, "नात्मा श्रुतेर्नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः" इति विरुध्यते । वैषम्यनैर्घृण्यपरिहारश्च, जीवानामनादित्वाभ्युपगमेन तत्कर्म-निमित्ततया प्रतिपादितः; "वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात्", "न कर्माविभा-गादिति चेन्न, अनादित्वादुपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च" इति, अकृताभ्यागमकृत-विप्रणाशप्रसङ्गश्च अनित्यत्वे अभिहितः ।

**89.** **(Reply):** (Brahman) inclusive of individual selves and the universe is maintained to be the cause as a whole. If Īśvara is admitted to transform himself into the individual self, the aphorism, 'The self is not originated, because the scripture denies origination of the self and also because the scriptural texts speak of the eternity of the self (*Bra. II, III*, 19)' is contradicted. The ascription of partiality and cruelty to Īśvara is repudiated on the ground of the beginninglessness of the individual selves and the responsibility of their karma for the inequalities and sufferings of individuals. The aphorisms connected with this issue are, 'Partiality and cruelty are not to be ascribed to Brahman, because of the dependence on karma', and 'If it be said, "There is no karma, as there was no differentiation" we deny that supposition on the ground of beginninglessness; it is reasonable and so found in actuality (*Bra. II, I*, 35–36)'. It is also pointed out that if the individual self were to be non-eternal, there would be actions, unproductive of fruits and experiences of fruits of action, uncaused by action.

९०. तथा प्रकृतेरप्यनादिता श्रुतिभिः प्रतिपादिता — "अजामेकां लोहितशुक्लकृष्णां बह्वीं प्रजां जनयन्तीं सरूपाम्, अजो ह्येको जुषमाणोऽनुशेते जहात्येनां भुक्तभोगामजोऽन्यः" इति प्रकृतिपुरुषयोरजत्वं दर्शयति । "अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत् तस्मिंश्चान्यो मायया सन्निरुद्धः, मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात् मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्" इति प्रकृतिरेव स्वरूपेण विकारास्पदमिति च दर्शयति । "गौरनाद्यन्तवती सा जनित्री भूतभाविनी" इति च ।

**90.** In the same way the texts state that prakṛti is also beginningless: 'There is one who is unborn, has red, white and black colours and gives birth to many creations similar in form. One "unborn one" abides with her, happy in her company and another "unborn one" abandons her having experienced the pleasures and pains she could give (*Śve. IV*, 5)' This passage points out the unoriginated existence of both the

finite selves and nature. 'From that the magician fashions the entire world and another is imprisoned in the magic; know prakṛti to be māyā, the weilder of māyā is the great Lord (*Śve. IV*, 9–10)'. It is pointed out here that prakṛti is subject to change in its essential being. 'The cow, without a beginning and end, is the creatrix fashioning all beings'.

९१. स्मृतिश्च — "प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव विद्ध्यनादी उभावपि", "भूमिरापोऽनलो वायुः खं मनो बुद्धिरेव च । अहङ्कार इतीयं मे भिन्ना प्रकृतिरष्टधा ॥ अपरेयमितस्त्वन्यां प्रकृतिं विद्धि मे पराम् । जीवभूतां महाबाहो ययेदं धार्यते जगत्", "प्रकृतिं स्वामवष्टभ्य विसृजामि पुनः पुनः", "मयाध्यक्षेण प्रकृतिः सूयते सचराचरम्" इत्यादिका ।

**91.** The Smṛtis also say, 'Know that prakṛti and puruṣa are both beginningless (*Gītā, XIII*, 19)'. 'The earth, water, fire, air, ether, mind, intellect and ego, these eight constitute a distinct prakṛti of mine. This is my inferior prakṛti. There is a superior prakṛti of mine. That, know thou, O Arjuna, is of the nature of the jīvas, by which this world is sustained (*Gītā, VII*, 4)', 'Utilizing my own prakṛti, I release them into being again and again (*Gītā, IX*, 8)', 'Supervised by me the supreme supervising power, prakṛti brings forth the world of moving and non-moving beings (*Gītā, IX*, 10)'.

९२. एवं च प्रकृतेरपि ईश्वरशरीरत्वात्, प्रकृतिशब्दोऽपि तदात्मभूतस्य ईश्वरस्य, तत्प्रकारसंस्थितस्य वाचकः । पुरुषशब्दोऽपि तदात्मभूतस्य ईश्वरस्य पुरुषप्रकारसंस्थितस्य वाचकः । अतः तद्विकाराणामपि तथैव ईश्वरः आत्मा । तदाह — "व्यक्तं विष्णुस्तथाव्यक्तं पुरुषः काल एव च", "स एव क्षोभको ब्रह्मन् क्षोभ्यश्च परमेश्वरः" इति । अतः प्रकृतिप्रकारसंस्थिते परमात्मनि प्रकारभूतप्रकृत्यंशे विकारः, प्रकार्यंशे च अविकारः । एवमेव जीवप्रकारसंस्थिते परमात्मनि च प्रकारभूतजीवांशे सर्वे च अपुरुषार्थाः; प्रकार्यंशः नियन्ता निरवद्यः सर्वकल्याणगुणाश्रयः सत्यसङ्कल्प एव । तथा च सति

कारणावस्थ ईश्वर एवेति, तदुपदानकजगत्—कार्यावस्थोऽपि स एवेति कार्यकारणयोरनन्यत्वं, सर्वश्रुत्यविरोधश्च भवति ।

92. Now prakṛti also constitutes the body of Īśvara. Therefore, the term 'prakṛti' denotes Īśvara, who is the inner self of prakṛti and has prakṛti as his mode. The term 'puruṣa' also denotes Īśvara, who is the inner self of the puruṣa and has puruṣa as his mode. Therefore, Īśvara is the indwelling self of the modification of prakṛti as well as puruṣa. This truth is recorded thus: 'The manifested nature is Viṣṇu. Even so the unmanifested nature is Viṣṇu. The individual self is Viṣṇu. Time is Viṣṇu (*Vi. I, II*, 18)' and 'He, the supreme Lord is the agitator as well as the agitated (*Vi. I, II*, 31)'. Thus in the supreme Self, characterized by prakṛti as his mode, there is change in the aspect of the mode consisting of prakṛti, and changelessness in the substantive aspect, in which the mode is inherent. In the same way, in the highest Self, characterized by the individual self as his mode, there are imperfections in the aspect of the mode consisting of the individual self, while in the substantive aspect, in which, the mode is inherent, he is the ruler, free from flaws, the abode of all auspicious attributes and has a will that unfailingly realizes itself. Thus it is the supreme Lord, that exists in the causal state and again it is he, that exists in the state of the effect, as the world, of which the material cause is the supreme Lord himself. In this manner the identity between cause and effect is to be comprehended and thus all utterances of the sacred scriptures are rendered free of contradiction.

९३. तदेवं नामरूपविभागानर्हसूक्ष्मदशापन्नप्रकृतिपुरुषशरीरं ब्रह्म कारणावस्थम् । जगतः तदापत्तिरेव च प्रलयः । नामरूपविभागविभक्तस्थूलचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरं ब्रह्म कार्यावस्थम् । ब्रह्मणः तथाविधस्थूलभाव एव सृष्टिः इत्युच्यते । यथोक्तं भगवता पराशरेण—"प्रधानपुंसोरजयोः कारणं कार्यभूतयोः" इति ।

**93.** Brahman is in the causal state, when its body consists of the individual selves and physical nature, in their subtle condition not distinguishable by differentiations of name and form. The passage of the world to this phase of existence is what is termed 'dissolution'. Brahman, having as its body, the individual selves and nature, in their gross manifested condition distinguished by differentiations of names and forms is in the state of the effect. The assumption of this manifestation and grossness of aspect is described as 'creation'. So says Bhagavān Parāśara: 'He is the cause of the effects, the unoriginated pradhāna and puruṣa (*Vi. I, IX*, 37)'.

९४. तस्मात् ईश्वरप्रकारभूतसर्वावस्थप्रकृतिपुरुषवाचिनः शब्दाः तत्प्रकारविशिष्टतया अवस्थिते परमात्मनि मुख्यतया वर्तन्ते, जीवात्मवाचिदेवमनुष्यादिशब्दवत्; यथा देवमनुष्यादिशब्दाः देवमनुष्यादिप्रकृतिपरिणाम, विशेषाणां जीवात्मप्रकारतयैव पदार्थत्वात्, प्रकारिणि जीवात्मनि मुख्यतया वर्तन्ते । तस्मात् सर्वस्य चिदचिद्वस्तुनः परमात्मशरीरतया तत्प्रकारत्वात्-परमात्मनि मुख्यतया वर्तन्ते सर्वे तद्वाचकाः शब्दाः ।

**94.** Therefore, terms denotative of primordial nature and individual selves, in all their states of being, are denotative, in the primary sense itself, of the highest Self, of which prakṛti and puruṣa are the modes and which exists having them as its modes. So do terms denoting bodies denote the individual selves indwelling in them. Terms like gods and men, denoting the varied physical bodies, signify in their primary signification, the individual selves, of which the bodies form modes and forming modes of which they possess existence. So the sentient and non-sentient beings forming bodies of the Supreme and thus acquiring their existential status as the modes of the Supreme, all terms denotative of them are denotative of the Supreme in their principal signification.

९५. अयमेव च आत्मशरीरभावः—पृथक्सिद्ध्यनर्हाधाराधेयभावः नियन्तृनियाम्यभावः शेषशेषिभावश्च । सर्वात्मना आधारतया नियन्तृतया शेषतया च आप्नोतीति आत्मा; सर्वात्मना आधेयतया नियाम्यतया शेषतया च अपृथक्सिद्धं प्रकारभूतमिति आकारः शरीरम् इति च उच्यते । एवमेव हि जीवात्मना स्वशरीरसम्बन्धः । एवमेव परमात्मनः सर्वशरीरत्वेन सर्वशब्दवाच्यत्वम् ।

**95.** This is the fundamental relationship between the Supreme and the universe of individual selves and physical entities. It is the relationship of soul and body, the inseparable relationship of the supporter and the supported, that of the controller and the controlled, and that of the principal entity and the subsidiary entity. That which takes possession of another entity entirely as the latter's support, controller and principal, is called the soul of that latter entity. That which, in its entirety, depends upon, is controlled by and subserves another and is therefore its inseparable mode, is called the body of the latter. Such is the relation between the individual self and its body. Such being the relationship, the supreme Self, having all as its body, is denoted by all terms.

९६. तदाह श्रुतिगणः—"सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति", "सर्वे वेदा यत्रैकं भवन्ति" इति । तस्य एकस्य वाच्यत्वादेकार्थवाचिनो भवन्ति इत्यर्थः । "एको देवो बहुधा सन्निविष्टः", "सहैव सन्तं न विजानन्ति देवाः" इत्यादि । देवाः इन्द्रियाणि । देवमनुष्यादीनामन्तर्यामितया आत्मत्वेन निविश्य, 'सहैव सन्तं' तेषामिन्द्रियाणि मनःपर्यन्तानि न 'विजानन्ति' इत्यर्थः ।

**96.** So declare the Vedas with massive unanimity: 'That Goal which all the Vedas reveal (*Ka. II*, 95)' and 'That in which all the Vedas become one (*Ā. III*, 11)'. The meaning of all the Vedas becoming one is that all the Vedas are unanimous in their import as that 'one' is their purport.

'The one God existing in the many (*Ā. III*, 14)' and 'The gods do not comprehend Him, who is verily with them (*Ā. III*, 11)'; here the word 'gods' means the senses. The senses including the mind of all beings like gods and men, do not comprehend him, who is verily with them, being the inner ruler and the very soul of all the beings like gods and men.

९७. तथा च पौराणिकानि वचांसि — "नताः स्म सर्ववचसां प्रतिष्ठा यत्र शाश्वती" — वाच्ये हि वचसः प्रतिष्ठा "कार्याणां कारणं पूर्वं वचसां वाच्यमुत्तमम्", "वेदैश्च सर्वैरहमेव वेद्यः" इत्यादीनि सर्वाणि हि वचांसि सशरीरात्मविशिष्टमन्तर्यामिणमेव आचक्षते । "तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि" इति हि श्रुतिः ।

**97.** Similar is the drift of the purāṇas: 'We bow down in obeisance to that, in which all words are eternally established (*Vi. I, XIV*, 3)'. In the entity signified are the words established truly. 'The prior cause of all effects, the best significance of words (*Jitaṁ te stotra*, 7)' and 'I am the one theme of all the Vedas (*Gītā, XV*, 95)'; All words signify the inner ruler characterized by the individual souls, along with their bodies. Indeed the Vedānta text has it, 'Entering these three deities, as the ātman, the jīva, I will differentiate names and forms'.

९८. तथा च मानवं वचः — "प्रशासितारं सर्वेषामणीयांसमणीयसाम् । रुक्माभं स्वप्नधीगम्यं विद्यात्तु पुरुषं परम्" । अन्तः प्रविश्य अन्तर्यामितया, सर्वेषां प्रशासितारं नियन्तारम्, अणीयांसः आत्मानः, कृत्स्नस्याचेतनस्य व्यापकतया सूक्ष्मभूताः, तेषामपि व्यापकत्वात् तेभ्योऽपि सूक्ष्मतरः इत्यर्थः । रुक्माभः आदित्यवर्णः, । स्वप्नधीगम्यः स्वप्नकल्पबुद्धिप्राप्यः । विशदतमप्रत्यक्षतापन्नानुध्यानैकलभ्यः इत्यर्थः । "एनमेके वदन्त्यग्निं मरुतोऽन्ये प्रजापतिम् । इन्द्रमेके परे प्राणम् अपरे ब्रह्म शाश्वतम् ॥" इति । एके वेदाः इत्यर्थः । उक्तरीत्या परस्यैव ब्रह्मणः सर्वस्य प्रशासितृत्वेन सर्वान्तरात्मतया

प्रविश्य अवस्थितत्वात् अग्न्यादयोऽपि शब्दाः, शाश्वतब्रह्मशब्दवत्, तस्यैव वाचका भवन्ति इत्यर्थः । तथा च स्मृत्यन्तरम् — "ये यजन्ति पितॄन् देवान् ब्राह्मणान् सहुताशनान् । सर्वभूतान्तरात्मानं विष्णुमेव यजन्ति ते ॥" इति । पितृ-देव-ब्राह्मण-हुताशनादिशब्दाः तन्मुखेन तदन्तरात्मभूतस्य विष्णोरेव वाचकाः इत्युक्तं भवति ।

98. So are the words of Manu: 'Let one know the controller of all, subtler than the subtlest, of the radiance of gold, the supreme Person, who is comprehended by the intelligence operative in dream (*XII*, 122)'. The various descriptions mean as follows. 'The controller of all' means one who has entered into all beings as their inner ruler and thus controls them all. 'Subtler than the subtlest' means that the individuals are subtle as they pervade all the non-sentient existence and he pervading even the individual selves is subtler than they. 'Of the radiance of gold' means that he has the colour of the sun. 'To be comprehended by the intelligence operative in dream' means that intelligence, like that in dream-consciousness, can comprehend him. That means that meditation which has developed the vividness of the clearest perception, is the instrument for attaining him. 'Thus some say he is Agni, others say he is Prajāpati, others again say that he is Indra, while some others say he is Prāṇa. Others say that he is the eternal Brahman (*Ma. XII*, 123)'. 'Some' means the Vedic passages. The meaning of the whole text is that like the term 'Eternal Brahman' all the terms like Agni also signify the supreme Brahman only, on the principle formulated, because, as the controller and self of all, he abides within all. Other Smṛti texts carry the same purport like in following: 'Those who worship the manes, gods, brāhmaṇas along with their sacred fire, worship indeed Viṣṇu himself, who is the inner self of all beings (Dakṣa)'. The terms like manes, gods, brāhmaṇas and fire signify the entities so named in ordinary discourse

and through them ultimately name Viṣṇu himself who is the inner soul of all beings.

९९. अत्रेदं सर्वशास्त्रहृदयम् —

जीवात्मनः स्वयम् असङ्कुचितापरिच्छिन्ननिर्मलज्ञानस्वरूपाः सन्तः, कर्मरूपाविद्यावेष्टिताः, तत्तत्कर्मानुरूपज्ञानसङ्कोचमापन्नाः, ब्रह्मादिस्तम्बपर्यन्तविविधविचित्रदेहेषु प्रविष्टाः तत्तद्देहोचितलब्धज्ञानप्रसराः, तत्तद्देहात्माभिमानिनः, तदुचितकर्माणि कुर्वाणाः, तदनुगुणसुखदुःखोपभोगरूपसंसारप्रवाहं प्रतिपद्यन्ते । एतेषां संसारमोचनं भगवत्प्रपत्तिमन्तरेण नोपपद्यते इति, तदर्थं प्रथममेषां देवादिभेदरहितज्ञानैकाकारतया सर्वेषां साम्यं प्रतिपाद्य, तस्यापि स्वरूपस्य भगवच्छेषतैकस्वरूपैकरसतया भगवदात्मकतामपि प्रतिपाद्य, भगवत्स्वरूपं च हेयप्रत्यनीककल्याणैकतानतया सकलेतरविसजातीयम्, अनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणगणाश्रयं, स्वसङ्कल्पप्रवृत्तसमस्तचिदचिद्वस्तुजाततया सर्वस्य आत्मभूतं प्रतिपाद्य, तदुपासनं साङ्गं, तत्प्रापकं प्रतिपादयन्ति शास्त्राणीति ।

**99.** The heart of the whole śāstra is this: The individual selves are essentially of the nature of pure knowledge, devoid of restriction and limitation. They get covered up by nescience in the shape of karma. The consequence is that the scope and breadth of their knowledge is curtailed in accordance with their karma. They get embodied in the multifarious varieties of bodies from Brahmā down to the lowest species. The knowledge is limited in accordance with their specific embodiment. They are deluded into identification with their bodies. In accordance with them they become subject to joys and sorrows, which, in essence constitute what is termed 'the river of transmigratory existence'. For these individual selves, so lost in saṁsāra, there is no way of emancipation, other than surrender to the supreme Lord. For the purpose of inculcating that sole way of emancipation, the first truth to be taught by the śāstra is that the individual selves are not intrinsically divided into

several kinds, like gods, men, etc., and that they are fundamentally alike and are equal in having knowledge as their essential nature. The essential nature of the individual self is such that it is wholly subservient and instrumental to God and therefore God is its inner self. The nature of the supreme Being is unique, on account of his absolute perfection and absolute antithesis to everything that is evil. God is the ocean of countless, infinitely excellent attributes. The śastras further assert that all sentient and non-sentient entities are sustained and operated by the supreme Being. Therefore, the Supreme is the ultimate self of all. They teach meditation along with its accessory conditions as the means for attaining him.

१००. यथोक्तम् — "निर्वाणमय एवायमात्मा ज्ञानमयोऽमलः । दुःखाज्ञानमला धर्माः प्रकृतेस्ते न चात्मनः ॥", "प्रकृतिसंसर्गकृतकर्ममूलत्वात् न आत्मस्वरूपप्रयुक्ताः धर्माः" इत्यर्थः । प्राप्ताप्राप्तविवेकेन "प्रकृतेरेव धर्माः" इत्युक्तम् ।

**100.** That these are the quintessential principles may be substantiated: 'The self is filled with nirvāṇa; and is filled with knowledge and is pure. Sorrow, ignorance and impurity are the properties of matter and not of the self (*Vi. VII*, *VII*, 22)'. The latter are contingent, having been brought about by karma, which is due to association with matter. They are not due to the inherent characteristics of the self. By the method of difference, they are stated to be the properties of matter.

१०१. "विद्याविनयसम्पन्ने ब्राह्मणे गवि हस्तिनि । शुनि चैव श्वपाके च पण्डिताः समदर्शिनः ॥" इति, देव-तिर्यङ्-मनुष्य-स्थावररूप-प्रकृति-संसृष्टस्य आत्मनः, स्वरूपविवेचनी बुद्धिः येषां ते पण्डिताः, तत्तत्प्रकृतिविशेष-विविक्तात्मयाथात्म्यज्ञानवन्तः, तत्र तत्र अत्यन्तविषमाकारे वर्तमानम् आत्मानं समानाकारं पश्यन्तीति "समदर्शिनः" इत्युक्तम् ।

**101.** 'The wise look upon as equal one blessed with knowledge and humility, a mere brāhmaṇa, a cow, an elephant, a dog and an outcaste (*Gītā*, *V*, 18)'. The wise are those who can distinguish the essential nature of the self even though it is associated with any of the varied kinds of bodies, like the heavenly, human, animal and plant. They are enlightened about the nature of the self, as transcending the varied and specialized modifications of material nature. They discern the equal nature of all selves, embodied in the most unequal and dissimilar material forms. Therefore they are said to have the vision of equality.

१०२. तदिदमाह—"इहैव तैर्जितः सर्गो येषां साम्ये स्थितं मनः । निर्दोषं हि समं ब्रह्म तस्माद्ब्रह्मणि ते स्थिताः ॥" इति । निर्दोषं देवादिप्रकृतिविशेषसंसर्गरूपदोषरहितम् । स्वरूपेणावस्थितं सर्वम् आत्मवस्तु निर्वाणरूपज्ञानैकाकारतया 'समम्' इत्यर्थः ।

**102.** It is further said, 'Those whose minds are established in equality, have overcome bondage even while here. The Brahman is stainless and equal. Therefore they are established in Brahman (*Gītā*, *V*, 19)'; 'stainless' means freed from the stain that consists in being associated with the various material forms. All selves, existing in their intrinsic and original character, have only knowledge of the nature of nirvāṇa as their essential form and therefore are equal.

१०३. तस्यैवम्भूतस्य आत्मनः भगवच्छेषतैकरसता, तन्नियाम्यता, तदेकाधारता च, तत्तच्छरीर-तत्तनुप्रभृतिभिश्शब्दैः, तत्सामानाधिकरण्येन च श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणादिषु प्रतिपाद्यते इति पूर्वमेवोक्तम् ।

**103.** Further, the individual self, so constituted, is wholly subservient to the Lord and is controlled by him and has him as its sole support. This idea has been expressed by śruti, smṛti, itihāsa and purāṇa through the description of the individual self as the body of Brahman and through statements

affirming the identity of the individual self and Brahman. All this has been explained before.

१०४. "दैवी ह्येषा गुणमयी मम माया दुरत्यया । मामेव ये प्रपद्यन्ते मायामेतां तरन्ति ते ॥" इति, तस्यैतस्य आत्मनः कर्मकृतविचित्रगुणमयप्रकृतिसंसर्गरूपात् संसारात् मोक्षः भगवत्प्रपत्तिमन्तरेण नोपपद्यते इत्युक्तं भवति; "नान्यः पन्था अयनाय विद्यते" इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिभिश्च ।

**104.** 'This māyā of mine, characterised by the qualities of sattva, rajas and tamas, being divine, cannot be crossed. Those who surrender to me only are the ones that cross this māyā (*Gītā*, *VII*, 14)'; the individual self, of the character described above, knows no emancipation from this bondage, of the nature of association with physical forms characterized by the various qualities which has been brought about by karma, except by surrender to the Supreme. The śruti also says, 'There is no other way for this goal (*Pu.* 17)'.

१०५. मया ततमिदं सर्वं जगदव्यक्तमूर्तिना ।
मत्स्थानि सर्वभूतानि न चाहं तेष्ववस्थितः ॥
न च मत्स्थानि भूतानि पश्य मे योगमैश्वरम् ।

इति, सर्वशक्तियोगात् स्वैश्वर्यवैचित्र्यमुक्तम् । तदाह "विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत्" इति । अनन्तविचित्रमहाश्चर्यरूपं जगत्, मम अयुतायुतांशांशेन आत्मतया प्रविश्य, सर्वं मत्सङ्कल्पेन विष्टभ्य, अनेन रूपेण अनन्तमहाविभूतिः अपरिमितोदारगुणसागरः निरतिशयाश्चर्यभूतः स्थितः अहम् इत्यर्थः ।

**105.** 'By me, of the imperceptible form, is all this permeated. All beings have their being in me and I do not have my being in them. And again, they do not have their being in me. See this transcendent power of mine, the power of Īśvara (*Gītā*, *IX*, 4–5)'; as the Supreme has all powers, its control of the cosmos is surpassingly wondrous. The text says, 'Controlling all this universe by a mere part of myself I abide (*Gītā*, *X*, 42)'. The meaning of this is, 'I have entered this infinitely variegated and wondrous universe as its inner self by

an infinitesimal part of myself and control all by mere will. In this form I abide, possessed of infinite and immense glory, an ocean of exalted attributes and an unsurpassed wonder'.

१९६. तदिदमाह—"एकत्वे सति नानात्वं नानात्वे सति चैकता । अचिन्त्यं ब्रह्मणो रूपं कस्तद्वेदितुमर्हति ।" इति, प्रशासितृत्वेन एक एव सन् विचित्रचिदचिद्वस्तुषु अन्तरात्मतया प्रविश्य, तत्तद्रूपेण विचित्रप्रकारः, विचित्रकर्म कारयन् नानारूपतां भजते । एवं स्वल्पाल्पांशेन तु सर्वाश्चर्यमयं नानारूपं जगत् तदन्तरात्मतया प्रविश्य विष्टभ्य नानात्वेनावस्थितोऽपि सन् अनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणगणः सर्वेश्वरेश्वरः परब्रह्मभूतः पुरुषोत्तमः नारायणः निरतिशयाश्चर्यभूतः नीलतोयदसङ्काशः पुण्डरीकदलामलायतेक्षणः सहस्रांशुः सहस्रकिरणः, परमे व्योम्नि "यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन्", "तदक्षरे परमे व्योमन्" इत्यादिश्रुतिसिद्धे एक एव अवतिष्ठते ।

**106.** The mystery of the Divine is further praised, 'Who can comprehend that incomprehensible form of Brahman, which being one, is many and being many, is one'. God is one as the ruler of the universe. But he enters into all spiritual and physical entities as their inner self, appropriates them as his wondrous forms and modes and causes wondrous activities. Thus he flourishes in a plurality of forms. Having thus entered into this wondrous and manifold universe by an infinitesimal part of himself as its inner soul and controlling it all, though God stands in a plurality of forms, he remains absolutely one, the repository of infinite and surpassingly perfect attributes, the Lord of lords, the highest Brahman, the supreme Person, Nārāyaṇa; Nārāyaṇa, who is the supreme marvel, who is like the blue cloud, with eyes wide and pure like the petals of lotus, and with the radiance of a thousand suns. He dwells in the transcendent realm as spoken of in the Vedic passages, 'Who knows him as treasured in the cavern of the highest sky (*Tai. I*, 4)' and 'In that imperishable and highest sky'.

१०७. ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तस्य कस्यचिदपि वस्तुनः एकस्वभावस्य एककार्य-शक्तियुक्तस्य एकरूपस्य, रूपान्तरयोगः स्वभावान्तरयोगः शक्त्यन्तरयोगश्च न घटते; तस्य एकस्य परस्य ब्रह्मणः, सर्ववस्तुविसजातीयतया सर्वस्वभावत्वं सर्वशक्तियोगश्चेति, एकस्यैव विचित्रानन्तनानारूपता च, पुनरपि अनन्ता-परिमिताश्चर्ययोगेन एकरूपता च न विरुद्धा इति वस्तुमात्रसाम्यात् विरोध-चिन्ता न युक्ता इत्यर्थः ।

**107.** No entity, other than Brahman, endowed with one type of nature, capable of performing one type of activity and having one particular type of form, can possess another type of form, another type of nature and another type of capacity. Only the supreme Brahman, even though it is a single reality, has all natures and capacities, being unique and altogether different from every other entity. Though it is one only, it has wondrous, infinite and manifold forms, and again by reason of its infinite, unlimited and mysterious powers it is of one form. This is not a self-contradiction in Brahman. Because it is similar to others, in being an entity, we ought not to regard it a self-contradiction in Brahman to have diversity of forms, powers and qualities as well as unity of being.

१०८. यथोक्तम्—

शक्तयः सर्वभावानाम् अचिन्त्यज्ञानगोचराः ।
यतोऽतो ब्रह्मणस्तास्तु सर्गाद्या भावशक्तयः ॥
भवन्ति तपतां श्रेष्ठ पावकस्य यथोष्णता ।

एतदुक्तं भवति—सर्वेषाम् अग्निजलादीनां भावानां एकस्मिन्नपि भावे दृष्टैव शक्तिः, तद्विसजातीयभावान्तरेऽपि इति न चिन्तयितुं युक्ता; जलादौ अदृष्टापि, तद्विसजातीये पावके भासकत्वोष्णत्वादिशक्तिः यथा दृश्यते, एवमेव सर्ववस्तुविसजातीये ब्रह्मणि सर्वसाम्यं नानुमातुं युक्तम् इति । अतः विचित्रानन्तशक्तियुक्तं ब्रह्म इत्यर्थः । तदाह—

जगदेतन्महाश्चर्यं रूपं यस्य महात्मनः ।
तेनाश्चर्यवरेणाहं भवता कृष्ण सङ्गतः ॥ इति ।

तदेतत् नानाविधानन्तश्रुतिनिकर-शिष्टपरिगृहीततद्व्याख्यानपरिश्रमात् अवधारितम् ।

**108.** This has been stated by Bhagavān Parāśara in the following verses: 'O the best of ascetics! the powers of all beings, incomprehensible to thought, like the power of creation, belong to Brahman. All such powers belong to it, even as heat belongs to fire (*Vi. I, III*, 2–3)'. The significance of the statement is this: Among the varied kinds of beings like fire and water, a power observed in one cannot be inferred as belonging to another category of things. The powers like heat and light, though not observed in water, do belong to fire, a substance of a different kind. Even so, Brahman which is unique and different from all other entities in kind, ought not to be conceived as limited in its powers, forms and qualities on the misapplied principle of analogy. Therefore, Brahman has wondrously manifold and infinite powers. (Akrūra exclaims), 'O Kṛśṇa, I am united with thee, the infinite Spirit, whose form this immensely marvellous universe is, and who in thyself art the grandest marvel (*Vi. V, XIX*, 7)'. This insight is the outcome of a devoted application to the study of the manifold and boundless śrutis and the commentaries thereon adopted by the great teachers.

१०९. तथा हि—प्रमाणान्तरापरिदृष्टापरिमितपरिणामानेकतत्त्वनियत-क्रमविशिष्टौ सृष्टिप्रलयौ ब्रह्मणः अनेकविधाः श्रुतयो वदन्ति ।

**109.** There are several types of śruti passages speaking of the creation and dissolution of the universe by Brahman, proceeding in rigorous order, involving a multitude of entities, subject to infinite modifications. All these matters relating to creation and dissolution are beyond the bounds of other sources of knowledge.

११०. निरवद्यं निरञ्जनं विज्ञानमानन्दं निर्विकारं निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निर्गुणमित्यादिकाः, निर्गुणं ज्ञानस्वरूपं ब्रह्मेति काश्चन श्रुतयो अभिदधति ।

**110.** There is one group of texts which describes Brahman as attributeless and as of the nature of knowledge like the following: 'Free from imperfection', 'free from evil', 'Knowledge', 'bliss', 'changeless', 'partless', 'actionless', 'full of peace' and 'attributeless'.

१११. "नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन, मृत्योस्स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति", "यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्, तत्केन कं पश्येत्, तत्केन कं विजानीयात्" इत्यादिकाः नानात्वनिषेधवादिन्यः सन्ति काश्चन श्रुतयः ।

**111.** There is another type of texts which denies plurality. The following serve as illustrations: 'There is no plurality here. He goes from death to death, who sees plurality here (*Bṛ. IV, IV*, 19)'; 'Where everything becomes the ātman, there, what is there to be seen? And by what means can anything be seen? There, what is there to be known? And by what means can anything be known? (*Bṛ. IV, V*, 15)'.

११२. "यस्सर्वज्ञस्सर्ववित् यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः", "सर्वाणि रूपाणि विचित्य धीरः नामानि कृत्वाभिवदन् यदास्ते", "सर्वे निमेषा जज्ञिरे विद्युतः पुरुषादधि", "अपहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युः विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसङ्कल्पः", इति, सर्वस्मिन् जगति हेयतया अवगतं सर्वं गुणं प्रतिषिध्य, निरतिशयकल्याणगुणानन्त्यं सर्वज्ञतां सर्वशक्तियोगं सर्वनामरूपव्याकरणं सर्वस्य आधारतां च काश्चन श्रुतयः ब्रुवते ।

**112.** There is another class of śrutis which denies of Brahman everything that is cognized as evil in the world and predicates of it infinite and surpassing auspicious attributes, omniscience, omnipotence, the authorship of the differentiations of all names and forms and the attribute of

being the support of all. They are exemplified by the following: 'He, who knows all, who cognizes all and whose penance consists of knowledge (*Mu. I, I*, 9)'; 'The intelligent one created all forms, gave names and remained proclaiming them all (*Pu.*, 16)'; 'From this luminous Person are all moments born (*Mahā. II*, 5)'; 'He is free from sin, old age, death, sorrow, hunger, and thirst. He has all desires fulfilled and his will comes true (*Chā. VIII, VII*, 1)'.

११३. "सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति", "ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्", "एकस्मिन् बहुधा विचारः" इत्यादिकाः ब्रह्मसृष्टं जगत् नानाकारं प्रतिपाद्य तदैक्यं च प्रतिपादयन्ति काश्चन श्रुतयः ।

**113.** There is, again, another variety of srutis: 'Al this is indeed Brahman, as all origines from, subsists in and dissolves into Brahman (*Chā. III, XIV*, 1)': 'All this is ensouled by this (*Chā. VI, VIII*, 7)'; 'Being one he is spread manifold (*Ā. VI*, 3)'. These describe the world created by Brahman in all its multiplicity and at the same time affirm its oneness.

११४. "पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा", "भोक्ता भोग्यं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा", "प्रजापतिरकामयत प्रजाः सृजेयेति", "पतिं विश्वस्यात्मेश्वरं शाश्वतं शिवमच्युतम्", "तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरं तं देवतानां परमं च दैवतम्", "सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः" इत्यादिकाः, ब्रह्मणः सर्वस्मादन्यत्वं, सर्वस्य ईशितव्यत्वम् ईश्वरत्वं च ब्रह्मणः, सर्वस्य शेषतां पतित्वं च ईश्वरस्य काश्चन ।

**114.** The following texts maintain that Brahman is distinct from all, that all else is subordinate to him, while he is their supreme ruler and that all entities are subsidiary to him, while he is their master: 'Knowing the self and the directing one as different (*Śve. I*, 12)'; 'Comprehending the experiencer, the experienced and the directing one (*Śve. I*, 25)'; 'The Lord of creatures desired, "Let me bring forth

creatures";' 'The master of the universe, the Lord of souls, ever-existent, the holy and the imperishable (*Mahā.* 11);' 'Him, who is the great Sovereign of sovereigns, the ultimate God of gods (*Śve. VI,* 13);' 'He in whose control everything is, and who rules all (*Bṛ. VI, IV,* 22).'

११५. "अन्तः प्रविष्टश्शास्ता जनानां सर्वात्मा", "एष त आत्मा अन्तर्याम्यमृतः", "यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं यस्यापश्शरीरं यस्य तेजश्शरीरम्" इत्यादि, "यस्याव्यक्तं शरीरं यस्याक्षरं शरीरं यस्य मृत्युश्शरीरं यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" इति, ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तस्य सर्वस्य वस्तुनः, ब्रह्मणश्च शरीरात्मभावं दर्शयन्ति काश्चन इति, नानारूपाणां वाक्यानाम् अविरोधः, मुख्यार्थापरित्यागश्च यथा सम्भवति तथैव वर्णनीयं वर्णितं च ।

**115.** Lastly, there are śruti texts like the following which declare that Brahman is the self of all other entities and that all of them constitute his body: "Having entered within, he rules and is the soul of all (*Ā. III,* 29)' 'He is your ātman, the inner controller immortal (*Bṛ. V, VII,* 3);' 'He, whose body the earth is, whose body the waters are, whose body fire is, whose body the unmanifested is, whose body the imperishable is, whose body death is, whose body the individual self is (*Su.* 7)'. The interpretation of the various types of texts must be such that they are not made to contradict among themselves in their contents; and not a single text should be so interpreted as to be divested of its primary and fundamental significance. Such is the exposition developed herein.

११५. अविकारश्रुतयः स्वरूपपरिणामपरिहारादेव मुख्यार्थाः; निर्गुणवादाश्च प्राकृतहेयगुणनिषेधविषयतया व्यवस्थिताः; नानात्वनिषेधवादाश्च एकस्यैव ब्रह्मणः शरीरतया प्रकारभूतं सर्वं चेतनाचेतनं वस्त्विति सर्वस्यात्मतया सर्वप्रकारं ब्रह्मैव अवस्थितमिति सुरक्षिताः; सर्वविलक्षणत्व-पतित्वेश्वरत्व-कल्याणगुणाकरत्व–सत्यकामत्व-सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वादिवाक्यं, तदभ्युपगमादेव

सुरक्षितम्; ज्ञानानन्दमात्रवादि च सर्वस्मादन्यस्य सर्वकल्याणगुणाश्रयस्य सर्वेश्वरस्य सर्वशेषिणः सर्वाधारस्य सर्वोत्पत्तिस्थितिप्रलयहेतुभूतस्य निरवद्यस्य निर्विकारस्य सर्वात्मभूतस्य परस्य ब्रह्मणः, स्वरूपनिरूपकधर्मः मलप्रत्यनीकानन्दरूपज्ञानमेवेति, स्वप्रकाशतया स्वरूपमपि ज्ञानमेवेति च प्रतिपादनात् अनुपालितम्; ऐक्यवादाश्च शरीरात्मभावेन सामानाधिकरण-मुख्यार्थतोपपादनादेव सुस्थिताः ।

**116.** The texts of the śruti declaring 'changelessness' are taken in their primary import, because modification in the substantive nature of Brahman has been denied. The propositions affirming Brahman to be 'attributeless' are given a determinate import as negating of Brahman the properties pertaining to matter and imperfections. The texts denying plurality, have their affirmations supported and sustained, through the conception that the whole universe, formed of sentient and non-sentient entities, constitutes the body and mode of Brahman and that Brahman alone exists as the self of all and has everything as its mode. The passages speaking of Brahman 'as different from all, as the Lord, as the supreme ruler, as the ocean of perfections, as having all desires fulfilled and as having a will that comes true' have been sustained by the admission of the affirmed attributes as ultimately real. The texts describing Brahman as sheer 'knowledge' and 'bliss' have their principal import thoroughly maintained. The supreme Brahman, the unique, the abode of all excellences, the ruler of all, the principal entity to which all are subsidiary, the supporting ground of all, the ground of creation, maintenance and destruction, the faultless and the immutable and the soul of all—has as its defining attribute, knowledge of the form of bliss, antithetical to all impurity; and being self-luminous, its substantive nature also is knwledge itself. This is the significance of the declarations that Brahman is sheer bliss and knowledge. The passages proclaiming unity have a well-established significance. Through

the conception of Brahman and the world as constituting soul and body, indentification, urged by co-ordinate predication, is brought out in the primary manner and thus the concept of ultimate unity is made to stand secure.

११७. एवं च सति, अभेदो वा भेदो वा द्व्यात्मकता वा वेदान्तवेद्यः कोऽयमर्थः समर्थितो भवति ? सर्वस्य वेदवेद्यत्वात् सर्वं समर्थितम् । सर्वशरीरतया सर्वप्रकारं ब्रह्मैव अवस्थितमिति, अभेदः समर्थितः; एकमेव ब्रह्म नानाभूतचिदचिद्वस्तुप्रकारं नानात्वेन अवस्थितम् इति भेदाभेदौ; अचिद्वस्तुनश्च चिद्वस्तुनश्च ईश्वरस्य च स्वरूपस्वभाववैलक्षण्यात् असङ्कराच्च भेदः समर्थितः '

**117.** It may be asked, 'What is your final position? Do you uphold unity or plurality or both unity and plurality? Which of these three forms the substance of the Vedānta on your interpretation?' We reply that we uphold all the three as they are all affirmed in the Veda. We uphold unity because Brahman alone exists, with all other entities as its modes. We uphold both unity and plurality, as the one Brahman itself, has all the spiritual and physical substances as its modes and thus exists qualified by a plurality. We uphold plurality as the three categories, sentient selves and non-sentient existents and the supreme Lord, are mutually distinct in their substantive nature and attributes and there is no mutual transposition of their characteristics.

११८. ननु च "तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो", "तस्य तावदेव चिरम्" इति ऐक्यज्ञानमेव परमपुरुषार्थलक्षणमोक्षसाधनमिति गम्यते । नैतदेवम्; "पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा जुष्टस्ततस्तेनामृतत्वमेति" इति, आत्मानं प्रेरितारं च अन्तर्यामिणं पृथक् मत्वा, ततः पृथक्त्वज्ञानाद्धेतोः, तेन परमात्मना जुष्टः अमृतत्वमेति इति, साक्षात् अमृतत्वप्राप्तिसाधनम् आत्मनः नियन्तुश्च पृथग्भावज्ञानमित्यवगम्यते ।

**118.** 'But', it may be said in objection, 'Only knowledge of unity is put forward as the means of attaining the *summum bonum*, the final liberation, in the passages, "That thou art, Śvetaketu" and "Only as long as he is not liberated". The position is not as you construe it. Here is a passage speaking of this matter, 'Knowing the self and the directing power as distinct, and thereby favoured by that power he attains immortality (*Śev. I*, 12)'. This is the meaning of the passage: Having known the self and the inner controller as distinct and by virtue of this knowledge of distinction, he attains immortality, graciously favoured by the supreme Self. Thus the direct means for the achievement of immortality is laid down to be the understanding of the difference between the individual self and the supreme controller.

११९. ऐक्यवाक्यविरोधात् एतत् अपरमार्थसगुणब्रह्मप्राप्तिविषयमिति अभ्युपगन्तव्यम् इति चेत्, पृथक्त्वज्ञानस्यैव साक्षात् अमृतत्वप्राप्तिसाधनत्वश्रवणात् विपरीतं कस्मात् न भवति ?

**199.** **(Objection):** As this passage is in conflict with the monistic passages, it must be construed as not giving us the knowledge of reality but only as inculcating the method of attaining the phenomenal Brahman qualified by attributes.

**(Reply):** If this view be urged, we ask, 'Why should not the contrary be the proper course of interpretation, especially in view of fact that the direct way leading to immortality is explicitly laid down in this passage?'

१२०. एतदुक्तं भवति—द्वयोः तुल्ययोः विरोधे सति, अविरोधेन तयोः विषयः विवेचनीयः इति। कथमविरोधः इति चेत्, अन्तर्यामिरूपेण अवस्थितस्य परस्य ब्रह्मणः शरीरतया प्रकारत्वात् जीवात्मनः, तत्प्रकारं ब्रह्मैव "त्वम्" इति शब्देन अभिधीयते; तथैव ज्ञातव्यम् इति तस्य वाक्यस्य अर्थः। एवम्भूतात् जीवात् तदात्मतया अवस्थितस्य परमात्मनो निखिलदोषरहिततया

सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वाद्यनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणाकरत्वेन च यः पृथग्भावः सोऽनुसन्धेय इति, अस्य वाक्यस्य विषयः इत्ययमर्थः पूर्वमेव असकृत् उक्तः ।

**120.** The proper approach to the whole situation would be to discern and extract a reconciling principle, when there are two (seemingly) contradictory pronouncements, possessing equal authority as sacred texts. If we are asked how our understanding of the texts establishes reconciliation, we reply thus: We maintain in the first place, that Brahman is the inner ruler and of this inner ruler, the individual self is a mode, being his body. Thus by the term 'thou' only the highest Brahman, characterized by the individual self as his mode is designated and denoted. This truth must be apprehended as such without any qualification. This is the meaning of the text 'That thou art'. In the second place, the highest Self is other than the individual self, in which the Supreme abides as the inmost self. As the Supreme is devoid of all imperfections and is characterized by countless and surpassing attributes of excellence, this 'otherness' in relation to the individual self is a verity. That this difference must be contemplated upon is the purport of the second passage. This has been set forth already many times.

१२१. "भोक्ता भोग्यं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा" इति, भोग्यभूतस्य वस्तुनः अचेतनत्वं परमार्थत्वं सततविकारास्पदत्वम् इत्यादयः स्वभावाः, भोक्तुः जीवात्मनश्च अमलापरिच्छिन्नज्ञानानन्दस्वभावस्यैव अनादिकर्मरूपाविद्याकृतः नानाविधज्ञानसङ्कोचविकासौ भोग्यभूताचिद्वस्तुसंसर्गश्च परमात्मोपासनात् मोक्षश्च इत्यादयः स्वभावाः एवम्भूतभोक्तृभोग्ययोः अन्तर्यामिरूपेण अवस्थानं, स्वरूपेण च अपरिमितगुणौघाश्रयत्वेन अवस्थानमिति, परस्य ब्रह्मणः त्रिविधावस्थानं ज्ञातव्यमित्यर्थः ।

**121.** The distinctions, whose knowledge is inculcated, are outlined in the passage, 'Comprehending the experiencer, the objects of experience and the directing power, all this

threefold Brahman is expounded (*Śve. I*, 12)'. All objects of experience are insentient, real and are always subject to modification. These qualities of physical nature must be discriminated. The individual self who enjoys and suffers has pure and unlimited knowledge and bliss as his inherent character. But his inherent character of knowledge and bliss sometimes expands and sometimes contracts in a multiplicity of ways conditioned by nescience, taking shape as the stream of beginningless karma. Consequently there is association with physical nature, described previously as 'the objects of experience'. The emancipation of the individual self is effected by the meditation on the supreme Self. These are the distinctive facts concerning the individual self. Brahman exists as the inner ruler of the non-sentient realm of 'the objects of experience' and of the individual self, the 'experiencer', both possessing the aforesaid characteristics. Brahman exists in its own intrinsic form, radiant with its own infinite perfections. These three forms of its existence are to be understood. The passage in question inculcates discriminating knowledge of the three entities and the three forms in which Brahman exists.

१२२. "तत्त्वमसि" इति सद्विद्यायाम् उपास्यं ब्रह्म सगुणं सगुणब्रह्मप्राप्तिश्च फलम् इत्यभियुक्तैः पूर्वाचार्यैः व्याख्यातम् ।

यथोक्तं वाक्यकारेण—"युक्तं तद्गुणकोपासनात्" इति । व्याख्यातं च द्रमिडाचार्येण विद्याविकल्पं वदता—"यद्यपि सच्चित्तो न निर्भुग्नदैवतं गुणगणं मनसा अनुधावेत्, तथापि अन्तर्गुणामेव देवतां भजते इति, तत्रापि सगुणैव देवता प्राप्यते" इति । सच्चित्तः सद्विद्यानिष्ठः । "न निर्भुग्नदैवतं गुणगणं मनसानुधावेत्" अपहतपाप्मत्वादिकल्याणगुणगणं दैवतात् विभक्तं यद्यपि दहरविद्यानिष्ठ इव, सच्चितो न स्मरेत्, "तथापि अन्तर्गुणामेव देवतां भजते" देवस्वरूपानुबन्धित्वात् सकलकल्याणगुणगणस्य केनचित् परदेवतासाधारणेन निखिलजगत्कारणत्वादिना गुणेन उपास्यमानापि देवता

वस्तुतः स्वरूपानुबन्धि सर्वकल्याणगुणगणविशिष्टैव उपास्यते; अतः सगुणमेव ब्रह्म तत्रापि प्राप्यमिति सद्विद्यादहरविद्ययोः विकल्पः इत्यर्थः ।

**122.** The great ancient teachers dealing with the meditation on 'sat' (advocated in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad), in relation to which meditation, the dictum 'That thou art' occurs, have maintained in their commentaries that Brahman, the subject-matter of the meditation is characterized by excellences of attributes and that the fruit of that meditation is the attainment of Brahman as abounding in attributes. The Vākyakāra[1] says, 'It is as qualified by attributes that Brahman is attained, for the meditation on Brahman is also as qualified'. Dramiḍācārya, who advocated choice of meditations, explains the principle as follows: 'The seeker meditating on 'sat' does not pursue meditatively the attributes to the exclusion of the Deity. But still he meditates on the Deity as inclusive of attributes and as such, the Deity attained is also possessed of attributes'. 'The seeker meditating on "sat" ' means one who is devoted to the meditation prescribed and elaborated in the section of Chāndogya known as sadvidyā. 'Does not pursue meditatively the attributes to the exclusion of the Deity' means that even though the devotee of the meditation on 'sat' does not dwell on the auspicious qualities like 'freedom from sin' apart from the Deity unlike the devotee of the meditation on dahara' (*i.e.*, subtle etheral space in the heart), he does meditate on the Deity as inclusive of attributes. All the glorious attributes of Brahman are inherent in its substantive nature and even when only some inherent and unique attributes, like being the cause of the world, are taken up for meditation along with the Deity, in reality, the Deity is meditated upon as characterized by all the inherent excellences of attributes. Therefore the Brahman to be reached by this meditation on sat'

[1] Taṅkācārya Brahmanandin.

also, is Brahman with attributes. Therefore either of these two types of meditation, sadvidya or daharavidyā can be chosen for cultivation.

१२३. ननु च सर्वस्य जन्तोः परमात्मा अन्तर्यामी तन्नियाम्यं च सर्वम् इत्युक्तम्; एवं च सति विधिनिषेधशास्त्राणाम् अधिकारी न दृश्यते; यः स्वबुद्धयैव प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिशक्तः, स एवं कुर्यात् न कुर्यादिति विधिनिषेधयोग्यः; न चैष दृश्यते; सर्वस्मिन् प्रवृत्तिजाते सर्वस्य प्रेरकः परमात्मा कारयिता इति तस्य सर्वनियमनं प्रतिपादितम् । श्रूयते च "एष एव साधुकर्म कारयति तं यमेभ्यो लोकेभ्य उन्निनीषति, एष एव असाधुकर्म कारयति तं यमधो निनीषति" इति साध्वसाधुकर्मकारयितृत्वात् नैर्घृण्यं च ।

**123. (Objection):** The following criticism may be raised: Now, you have held that all creatures are governed by the Supreme and that the Supreme is the inner controller of all. If that is the case, there appears to be no one to whom the scriptural injunctions and prohibitions could apply. Only he, who is capable of doing or abstaining from actions by initiative of his own intelligence, can be subject to the injunction of 'ought' and to the prohibition of 'ought not'. Such a personality is ruled out in your scheme. The supreme Self is held to be the directing spirit in relation to all activity and is said to cause action to be done. Such is the way in which his cosmic control is conceived. Further, sacred texts say, 'He gets good actions done by those whom he wants to lift up and gets evil actions done by those whom he wants to cast down (*Kau. III*, 9)'. By thus getting actions, good and bad, performed the godhead would be responsible for cruelty.

१२४. अत्रोच्यते—सर्वेषामेव चेतनानां चिच्छक्तियोगः प्रवृत्तिशक्तियोगः इत्यादि सर्वं प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिपरिकरं सामान्येन संविधाय, तन्निर्वहणाय तदाधारो भूत्वा अन्तः प्रविश्य, अनुमन्तृतया च नियमनं कुर्वन् शेषित्वेन

अवस्थितः परमात्मा । एतदाहितशक्तिस्सन् प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्त्यादि स्वयमेव कुरुते; एवं कुर्वाणमीक्षमाणः परमात्मा उदासीन आस्ते; अतः सर्वमुपपन्नम् । साध्वसाधुकर्म कारयितृत्वं तु व्यवस्थितविषयं, न सर्वसाधारणम् । यस्तु पूर्वं स्वयमेव अतिमात्रम् आनुकूल्ये प्रवृत्तः तं प्रति प्रीतः स्वयमेव भगवान् कल्याणबुद्धियोगदानं कुर्वन् कल्याणे प्रवर्तयति । यः पुनः अतिमात्रं प्रातिकूल्ये प्रवृत्तः तस्य तु क्रूरां बुद्धिं ददन् स्वयमेव क्रूरेष्वेव कर्मसु प्रेरयति भगवान् ।

**124. (Reply):** We answer this criticism as follows: The supreme Being endows all sentient beings with the power of thought and power of action. Thus the general equipment needed for the performance as well as the non-performance of actions is furnished by him. Then in order to manage the situation, he becomes the support and basis of all, enters into all beings and governs from within by his approbation of acts of individual will. He abides as the fundamental śeṣin' of all, all the individuals being subsidiary to him. The individual, thus equipped with all the requisite powers and facilities, endowed with the power of initiative, engages in actions and abstinence from action by his own spontaneity of will. The supreme Being, witnessing his activity, remains unconcerned. Thus the whole situation is intelligible. God's causing good and bad actions to be performed is not universal in relation to all moral agents. It is a situation that obtains in certain determinate circumstances. If an individual by himself is engaged in the pursuit of what is most in accordance with the will of God, God being pleased with him, confers upon him spontaneously a holy disposition of will and intellect and actuates him in the right and holy direction. If, on the other hand, an individual is pursuing what is most contrary to the divine will, the Lord gives him evil intellect and will and actuates him to proceed along evil lines.

१२५. यथोक्तं भगवता—

तेषां सततयुक्तानां भजतां प्रीतिपूर्वकम् ।
ददामि वुद्धियोगं तं येन मामुपयान्ति ते ॥
तेषामेवानुकम्पार्थमहमज्ञानजं तमः ।
नाशयाम्यात्मभावस्थो ज्ञानदीपेन भास्वता ॥
तानहं द्विषतः क्रूरान् संसारेषु नराधमान् ।
क्षिपाम्यजस्रमशुभान् आसुरीष्वेव योनिषु ॥ इति ।

**125.** The Lord has stated these principles: 'To those, who seek union with me always, and are devoted to me, I give with love, the power of wisdom, by which they attain unto me. And I, dwelling in their hearts, am moved by compassion and therefore destroy their darkness of soul born of ignorance by lighting the luminous lamp of their knowledge. But I cast again and again into unholy births, into saṁsāra, those who hate me, who are hard-hearted, who are wicked and are the worst of men (*Gītā*, *X*, 10–11 & *XVI*, 19)'.

१२६. सोऽयं परब्रह्मभूतः पुरुषोत्तमः, निरतिशयपुण्यसञ्चयक्षीणाशेषजन्मोपचितपापराशेः परमपुरुषचरणारविन्दशरणागतिजनिततदाभिमुख्यस्य सदाचार्योपदेशोपबृंहितशास्त्राधिगततत्त्वयाथात्म्यावबोधपूर्वकाहरहरुपचीयमानशमदमतपश्शौचक्षमार्जवभयाभयस्थानविवेकदयाहिंसाद्यात्मगुणोपेतस्य वर्णाश्रमोचितपरमपुरुषाराधनवेषनित्यनैमित्तिककर्मोपसंहृतिनिषिद्धपरिहारनिष्ठस्य परमपुरुषचरणारविन्दयुगलन्यस्तात्मात्मीयस्य तद्भक्तिकारितानवरतस्तुतिस्मृतिनमस्कृतियतनकीर्तनगुणश्रवणवचनध्यानार्चनप्रणामादिप्रीतपरमकारुणिकपुरुषोत्तमप्रसादविध्वस्तस्वान्तध्वान्तस्य, अनन्यप्रयोजनानवरतनिरतिशयप्रियविशदतमप्रत्यक्षतापन्नानुध्यानरूपभक्त्येकलभ्यः ।

**126.** Now this supreme Brahman, the supreme Person is to be attained. The pathway through which he is to be attained is as follows: By an accumulation of the greatest merit, the sins of the past gathered through all past lives,

are destroyed. A person, whose sins are thus destroyed through great merit, seeks refuge at the feet of the supreme Person. Such self-surrender begets an inclination towards him. Then the aspirant acquires knowledge of reality from the scriptures aided by the instruction of holy teachers. Then by a steady effort he develops in an ever-increasing measure the qualities of soul, like the control of the mind, the control of senses, austerity, purity, forgiveness, straightforwardness, discrimination as to what is to be feared and not feared, mercy and non-violence. He is devoted to the performance of the nitya and naimittika duties pertaining to his varṇa and āśrama, and aviods actions prohibited, such a course of conduct being conceived as the worship of the supreme Person. He offers his all and his very self at the lotus-like feet of the supreme Person. Actuated by loving devotion to him, he offers perpetual praise and obeisances, engages in perpetual remembrance of him, bows down before him in adoration perpetually, exerts himself always in the godward direction, always sings his glories, always listens to the exalted accounts of his perfections, speaks perpetually of those perfections, meditates upon him continuously, ceaselessly worships him and dedicates himself once for all to him. The supreme Person, who is overflowing with compassion, being pleased with such love, showers his grace on the aspirant, which destroys all his inner darkness. Bhakti develops in such a devotee towards the supreme Person, which is valued for its own sake, which is uninterrrupted, which is an absolute delight in itself and which is meditation that has taken on the character of the most vivid and immediate vision. Through such bhakti is the Supreme attained.

१२७. तदुक्तं परमगुरुभिः भगवद्यामुनाचार्यपादैः—“उभयपरिकर्मितस्वान्तस्य ऐकान्तिकात्यन्तिकभक्तियोगलभ्यः” इति । ज्ञानयोगकर्मयोगसंस्कृतान्तःकरणस्य इत्यर्थः । तथा च श्रुतिः—“विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं

सह, अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्यया अमृतमश्नुते" इति । अत्र अविद्याशब्देन विद्येतरत् वर्णाश्रमाचारादि पूर्वोक्तं कर्म उच्यते; विद्याशब्देन भक्तिरूपापन्न-ध्यानमुच्यते । यथोक्तम् —

"इयाज सोऽपि सुबहून् यज्ञान् ज्ञानव्यपाश्रयः ।
ब्रह्मविद्यामधिष्ठाय तर्तुं मृत्युमविद्यया ॥" इति,

"तमेवं विद्वानमृत इह भवति नान्यः पन्था अयनाय विद्यते", "य एनं विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति", "ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्", "ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति" इत्यादि । वेदनशब्देन ध्यानमेवाभिहितं "निदिध्यासितव्यः" इत्यादिना ऐकार्थ्यात् ।

**127.** The great teacher, Bhagavān Yāmunācārya says, 'He is attainable through the pathway of bhakti, which is an end in itself and ceaseless and succeeds the double training of the inward parts (*Siddhitraya*)'. 'The double training of the inward parts' means the culture of the inner sense by the discipline of jñāna and karma. The śruti also says, 'One who knows vidyā and avidyā together, crosses death through avidyā and attains immortality through vidyā (*Īśa.* 11)'. Here the word avidyā signifies what is other than vidyā, namely, the duties pertaining to one's station in life, like varṇa and āśrama. By the term vidyā is meant meditation that has developed into bhakti. It has been said, 'Resting on knowledge, he performed many sacrifices, with a view to overcoming death by means of avidyā and reach the vidyā of Brahman (*Vi. VI, vi,* 12)'. Further the śrutis say: 'Knowing him, one becomes immortal here. There is no other way to that goal (*Pu.* 17);' 'Those who know this one, become immortal (*Mahā. I,* 10);' 'One who knows Brahman, attains the Highest (*Tai. II,* 1);' 'He who knows Brahman, becomes Brahman (*Mu. III, II,* 9).' In all these and similar cases the term 'Knowledge' (vedana) signifies meditation (dhyāna). Knowledge is to be so understood because coherence with

such texts as 'He is to be meditated upon (*Bṛ. VI, V*, 6)' must be maintained.

१२८. तदेव ध्यानं पुनरपि विशिनष्टि—

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यः न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।

यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यः तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूं स्वाम् ॥ इति ।

भक्तिरूपापन्नानुध्यानेनैव लभ्यते न केवलवेदनमात्रेण, 'न मेधया' इति केवलस्य निषिद्धत्वात् । एतदुक्तं भवति—योऽयं मुमुक्षुः वेदान्तविहित-वेदनरूपध्यानादिनिष्ठः, तदा तस्य तस्मिन्नेव अनुध्याने निरवधिकातिशया प्रीतिः जायते, तदैव तेन लभ्यते परः पुरुषः इति । यथोक्तं भगवता—

पुरुषस्स परः पार्थ भक्त्या लभ्यस्त्वनन्यया ॥

भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्य अहमेवंविधोऽर्जुन ।

ज्ञातुं द्रष्टुं च तत्त्वेन प्रवेष्टुं च परन्तप ॥

भक्त्या मामभिजानाति यावान् यश्चास्मि तत्त्वतः ।

ततो मां तत्त्वतो ज्ञात्वा विशते तदनन्तरम् ॥ इति ।

तदनन्तरं मां तत एव भक्तेः विशते इत्यर्थः । भक्तिरपि निरतिशय-प्रियानन्यप्रयोजनस्वेतरवैतृष्ण्यावहज्ञानविशेष एवेति, तद्युक्त एव तेन परेण आत्मना वरणीयो भवतीति, तेन लभ्यते इति श्रुत्यर्थः ।

**128.** That meditation is further defined by the text, 'This ātman is not attained by the reflection on the sacred texts, by the exercise of intelligence or by excessive learning of the texts. By him, whom this ātman chooses, is he attained. To such a chosen one, the ātman reveals his form'. (*Mu. III, II*, 3 & *Ka. I, II*, 22)'. This determination of the character of meditation lays down that only meditation of the form of bhakti leads to the attainment of Brahman and the efficiency of mere meditation is denied by the phrase, 'Not by the exercise of intelligence'. To explain: When the seeker after emancipation, established in the knowledge prescribed in the Vedānta of the form of meditation, develops within himself all-absorbing and all-surpassing love for that medita-

tion itself, just at that very point of time is the supreme Person attained by him. The words of the Lord are to this effect: 'That supreme Puruṣa, Pārtha, is attainable by undivided bhakti (*Gītā*, *VIII*, 22);' 'I, of this nature, Arjuna, am such that by undivided bhakti one is able to understand me, to have a vision of me and to merge into me (*Gītā*, *XI*, 54);' 'By bhakti one truly understands me, as to what I am and the full expanse of my being. Then, by the same means, knowing me he enters into me (*Gītā*, *XVIII*, 53)'. Here the sentence 'Then, by the same means, knowing me, he enters into me' means that a person after understanding through bhakti, enters into the Supreme through bhakti itself. Bhakti is that particular kind of knowledge, which is a state that elicits absolute love towards itself, which is an end in itself, and eliminates the desire for everything else. One blessed with such bhakti attains the fitness to be chosen by the supreme Self. By him is the Supreme attained. This is the significance of the śruti under discussion.

१२९. एवंविधपरभक्तिरूपज्ञानविशेषस्य उत्पादकः पूर्वोक्ताहरहरुपचीयमानज्ञानपूर्वककर्मानुगृहीतभक्तियोग एव । यथोक्तं भगवता पराशरेण —

वर्णाश्रमाचारवता पुरुषेण परः पुमान् ।
विष्णुराराध्यते पन्था नान्यस्तत्तोषकारकः ॥ इति ।

निखिलजगदुद्धरणाय अवनितले अवतीर्णः परब्रह्मभूतः पुरुषोत्तमः स्वयमेव एतदुक्तवान् —

स्वकर्मनिरतस्सिद्धिं यथा विन्दति तच्छृणु ॥
यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।
स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ॥ इति ।

यथोदितक्रमपरिणतभक्त्यैकलभ्य एव ।

**129.** This particular kind of knowledge of the nature of the highest bhakti, is brought about only by bhakiyoga

already delineated, which grows by continuous practice, and is assisted by karma which follows jñāna. Bhagavān Parāśara says, 'A man, who performs the duties of his varṇa and āśrama, can worship the supreme Person, Viṣṇu; no other way pleases him (*Vi. II, viii,* 9)'. The highest Brahman, the supreme Person, incarnated on earth for the uplift of the whole world, has himself ordained, 'Listen, how a man devoted to his own duties can attain realization. By worshipping the Lord, from whom proceed all beings and by whom all this is pervaded, through such duties as are appropriate to oneself, one attains realization (*Gītā, XVIII,* 45-46)'. Thus the Supreme is attainable only through bhakti, which is the fruition of the spiritual development described.

१३०. भगवद्बोधायन-टङ्क-द्रमिड-गुहदेव-कपर्दि-भारुचि-प्रभृत्यविगीतशिष्ट-परिगृहीतपुरातनवेदान्तव्याख्यानसुव्यक्तार्थ-श्रुतिनिकरनिदर्शितोऽयं पन्थाः । अनेन चार्वाक-शाक्य-औलूक्य-अक्षपाद-क्षपणक-कपिल-पतञ्जलिमतानुसारिणो वेदबाह्याः वेदावलम्बिकुदृष्टिभिस्सह निरस्ताः ।

**130.** The philosophical approach developed herein is one that has been presented by the Vedas, whose import has been clearly revealed by the ancient commentaries on the Vedas and Vedānta and has been unanimously adopted by the great ones like Bhagavān Bodhāyana, Ṭaṅka, Dramiḍa, Guhadeva, Kapardin and Bhāruci. By this, the extra-Vedic schools of thought like those of Cārvāka, Śākya, Aulūkya, Akṣpāda, Kṣapaṇaka, Kapila and Patañjali along with the schools of some followers of the Vedas whose vision is perverted, are refuted.

१३१. वेदावलम्बिनामपि यथावस्थितवस्तुविपर्यस्तदृशां बाह्यसाम्यं मनुनैव उक्तम्—

या वेदबाह्याः स्मृतयः याश्च काश्च कुदृष्टयः ।
सर्वास्ता निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमोनिष्ठा हि ताः स्मृताः ॥ इति ।

रजस्तमोभ्यामस्पृष्टम् उत्तमं सत्त्वमेव येषां स्वाभाविको गुण: तेषामेव वैदिकी रुचिः वेदार्थयाथात्म्यावबोधश्च इत्यर्थः । यथोक्तं मात्स्ये —

सङ्कीर्णाः सात्त्विकांश्चैव राजसाः तामसास्तथा ॥ इति ।

केचिद्ब्रह्मकल्पाः सङ्कीर्णाः, केचित् सत्त्वप्रायाः, केचित् रजःप्रायाः, केचित् तमःप्रायाः इति कल्पविभागमुक्त्वा, सत्त्वरजस्तमोमयानां तत्त्वानां माहात्म्यवर्णनञ्च तत्तत्कल्पप्रोक्तपुराणेषु सत्त्वादिगुणमयेन ब्रह्मणा क्रियते इति च उक्तम्;

यस्मिन् कल्पे तु यत्प्रोक्तं पुराणं ब्रह्मणा पुरा ।
तस्य तस्य तु माहात्म्यं तत्स्वरूपेण वर्ण्यते ॥ इति ।

विशेषतश्च उक्तम् —

अग्नेश्शिवस्य माहात्म्यं तामसेषु प्रकीर्त्यते ।
राजसेषु च माहात्म्यम् अधिकं ब्रह्मणो विदुः ॥
सात्त्विकेष्वथ कल्पेषु माहात्म्यमधिकं हरेः ।
तेष्वेव योगसंसिद्धाः गमिष्यन्ति परां गतिम् ॥
सङ्कीर्णेषु सरस्वत्याः पितॄणाम् . . . . इत्यादि ॥

**131.** That even the followers of the Vedas, who take a wrong view of things, are to be judged on a footing of equality with the non-Vedic thinkers has been laid down by Manu himself. He says, 'The smritis that are non-Vedic and the views that are perverse, are futile, being established in tamas (*XII*, 96)'. Only those who have sattva uncontaminated by rajas and tamas as their innate propensity have a taste for the Vedas and an understanding of the real contents of the Vedas. *Matsyapurāṇa* accords with this proposition: 'There are four categories—the mixed, the sāttvika, the rājasa and the tāmasa'. Some epochs of Brahma are mixed, some are dominantly sāttvika, some are dominantly rājasa and some dominantly tāmasa. After this classification of epochs, it is stated that Brahmā dominated by the predominant quality of each epoch, proclaims the greatness of principles that

to be feared and what is not to be feared, and bondage and emancipation. That buddhi is rājasa through which dharma and adharma, actions to be done and actions not to be done are not cognized in the correct manner. That buddhi is tāmasa, which being enveloped in darkness takes adharma for dharma and in general takes everything, for its exact opposite (*Gita*, *XVIII*, 30-32)'. The author of each of the purāṇas, first of all gathered from Brahmā himself all the materials that should go into the particular purāṇa and then transmitted that body of information through his composition. Accordingly it has been stated, 'I will tell you, as Brahmā told, in reply to the questions put to him by the great sages like Dakṣa (*Vi. I*, *II*, 8)'. (This is the governing principle of evaluation in connection with the purāṇas). It may be asked, how we ought to proceed when we are confronted with conflicting passages of the Vedas, which are not personal compositions. Our reply is that the conflict can be eliminated by the determination of the total import of the texts, as already demonstrated.

१३३. यदपि चेदं विरुद्धमिव दृश्यते — "प्राणं मनसि सह करणैः नादान्ते परात्मनि । सम्प्रतिष्ठाप्य ध्यायीत ईशानं प्रध्यायीत एवं सर्वमिदम् । ब्रह्मविष्णुरुद्रेन्द्रास्ते सर्वे सम्प्रसूयन्ते । न कारणं....कारणं तु ध्येयः । सर्वैश्वर्यसम्पन्नः सर्वेश्वरः शम्भुः आकाशमध्ये ध्येयः ।"

यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किञ्चित् ।
यस्मान्नाणीयो न ज्यायोऽस्ति कश्चित् ।
वृक्ष इव स्तब्धो दिवि तिष्ठत्येकः । तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ।
ततो यदुत्तरतरं तदरूपमनामयम् ।
य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति । अथेतरे दुःखमेवापियन्ति ॥
सर्वाननशिरोग्रीवः सर्वभूतगुहाशयः ।
सर्वव्यापी च भगवान् तस्मात् सर्वगतश्शिवः ॥

यदा तमः तन्न दिवा न रात्रिः न सन्न चासच्छिव एव केवलः ।
तदक्षरं तत्सवितुर्वरेण्यं प्रज्ञा च तस्मात् प्रसृता पुराणी ।। इत्यादि ।
"नारायणः परं ब्रह्म" इति च पूर्वमेव प्रतिपादितम्; तेनास्य कथमविरोधः ?

**133. (Objection):** But there appears to be a discrepancy in the purport of the following texts: 'Establishing the prāṇa along with the senses on the highest Self, at the end of the nāda, in the mind, let one meditate on Īśāna. Let the seeker reflect that all these, these gods, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra and Indra, are all subject to birth and so they are not the cause. But the cause is to be meditated upon. Śambhu, the overlord of all, to whom belongs universal sovereignty, must be meditated upon in the centre of the ākāśa (*Atharva.*);' 'He, other than whom there is none that is great, subtle or big, stands firm like a tree in the heaven and he stands alone. By that Puruṣa is all this filled. That which is superior to him (*tatah*) and is formless and stainless is Bhagavān Śiva, whose are all the faces, heads and necks, who abides, in all hearts and who pervades all and has gone into all. Knowing him they attain immortality while others sink in sorrow. (*Sve. III*, 9-11);' 'In that darkness, which was neither day nor night, in which there was neither being nor non-being, only Śiva remained. He is imperishable, is great beyond the sun, and from him did all the ancient wisdom flow (*Sve. IV*, 18)'. But at the same time the śruti says, as previously propounded, 'Nārāyaṇa is the supreme Brahman (*Maha.*)'. How can these two sets of texts be free from mutual contradiction?

१३४. अत्यल्पमेतम् —

वेदवित्प्रवरप्रोक्तवाक्यन्यायोपबृंहिताः ।
वेदास्साङ्गा हरिं प्राहुः जगज्जन्मादिकारणम् ।।

"जन्माद्यस्य यतः", "यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । येन जातानि जीवन्ति । यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति । तद्विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्म ।" इति

जगज्जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्मेत्यवगम्यते । तच्च जगत्सृष्टिप्रलयप्रकरणेष्वेव अवगन्तव्यम् । "तदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् । एकमेवाद्वितीयम्" इति जगदुपादानताजगन्निमित्तताजगदन्तर्यामितादिमुखेन परमकारणं सच्छब्देन प्रतिपादितम् । अयमेवार्थः—"ब्रह्म वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्" इति शाखान्तरे ब्रह्मशब्देन प्रतिपादितः । अनेन सच्छब्दाभिहितं ब्रह्मेत्यवगतम् । अयमेवार्थः शाखान्तरे "आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत् । नान्यत् किञ्चन मिषत्" इति । तथा "सद्ब्रह्म"-शब्दाभ्यां आत्मैव अभिहित इत्यवगम्यते । तथा च शाखान्तरे "एको ह वै नारायण आसीत्, न ब्रह्मा नेशानो नेमे द्यावा पृथिवी "इत्यादिना सद्ब्रह्मात्मादिपरमकारणवाचिभिः शब्दैः नारायण एव अभिधीयत इति निश्चीयते ।

**134. (Reply):** This is a very trivial issue. The truth may be summed up in these words: The entire body of the Vedas, amplified by the words of the best of the knowers of the Vedas and the canons of interpretation, declares that Hari is the cause of the origin etc. of this universe. To explain: On the authority of the aphorism 'That from which the creation etc. of this universe proceed is Brahman (*Br. I, I,* 2)' and the text 'That from which all these creatures are born, that in which they all subsist and that into which they all enter, enquire into that and that is Brahman (*Tai. III,* 2)', we make out that cause of the creation etc. of the world is Brahman. We have to study it only in the sections which deal with the subject-matter of creation and dissolution. The text 'Being only, without a second (*Cha. VI, ii,* 1)' declares that the ultimate cause, described therein as 'Being' is Brahman by virtue of its being the material cause, efficient cause and the inner controller of the world. The same entity is spoken of in another section and is designated 'Brahman', as 'All this was Brahman, Brahman only, in the beginning (*Br. III, iv,* 10)'. By this we are made to understand that the principle described as 'sat' is Brahman. The same truth is conveyed in another branch of the text, 'All this was ātman only in

the beginning and nothing else was there (*Ai.* 1)'. This brings out that ātman itself was described in the other two sections as 'sat' and 'Brahman'. Similarly in another text it is said, 'Only Nārāyaṇa existed, neither Brahmā, nor Īśāna, nor the sky and earth (*Mahopaniṣad, I,* 1)'. The culminating inference is that Nārāyaṇa himself has been described in the other sections by the terms 'sat', 'Brahman' and 'ātman' all of which are applied to the ultimate cause.

१३५. "यमन्तस्समुद्रे कवयो वयन्ति" इत्यादि, "नैनमूर्ध्वं न तिर्यञ्चं न मध्ये परिजग्रभत् । न तस्येशे कश्चन तस्य नाम महद्यशः । न सन्दृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य न चक्षुषा पश्यति कश्चनैनम् । हृदा मनीषा मनसाभिक्लृप्तो य एनं विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति" इति सर्वस्मात् परत्वम् अस्य प्रतिपाद्य, "न तस्येशे कश्चन" इति तस्मात् परं किमपि न विद्यते इति च प्रतिषिध्य, "अद्भ्यस्सम्भूतो हिरण्यगर्भ इत्यष्टौ" इति तेन एकवाक्यतां गमयति; तच्च महापुरुषप्रकरणम्; ह्रीश्च ते लक्ष्मीश्च पत्न्यौ इति नारायण एवेति द्योतयति ।

**135.** Further, the text commencing with 'In the centre of the sea the wise men intuit him', goes on to say, 'none grasps him above, none horizontally, none in the centre; none rules over him. His glory is indeed great. His form does not get sighted. None sees him with his eyes. He is grasped by the wise with the heart and the mind. Those who know him become immortal (*Mahā.*)'. Thus his greatness beyond all else is declared and that there can be anything greater than him is denied by the sentence, 'None rules over him'. Then the direction 'Here the hymn commencing with "Born out of the waters" and eight ṛks commencing with "Hiraṇya-garbha" must be recited' connects the passages with the hymn to Puruṣa. That hymn has as its theme the supreme Puruṣa. The supreme Puruṣa is revealed to be Nārāyaṇa by the text, 'The goddess Hri and the goddess Lakṣmī are the two consorts (*Pu.* 24)'.

१३६. अयमर्थः नारायणानुवाके प्रपञ्चितः—"सहस्रशीर्षं देवम्" इत्यारभ्य, "स ब्रह्मा स शिवः सेन्द्रः सोऽक्षरः परमः स्वराट्" इति सर्वशाखासु परतत्वप्रतिपादनपरान् अक्षर-शिव-शम्भु-परब्रह्म-परज्ज्योति-पर-तत्त्वपरायण-परमात्मादिसर्वशब्दान् तत्तद्गुणयोगेन नारायण एव प्रयुज्य, तद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य समस्तस्य तदायत्ततां तद्व्याप्यतां तदाधारतां तन्नियाम्यतां तच्छेषतां तदात्मकतां च प्रतिपाद्य, ब्रह्मशिवयोरपि इन्द्रादिसमानाकारतया तद्विभूतित्वं च प्रतिपादितम् । इदं च वाक्यं केवलपरतत्त्वप्रतिपादनपरम्, अन्यत् किञ्चिदपि अत्र न विधीयते । अस्मिन् वाक्ये प्रतिपादितस्य सर्वस्मात् परत्वेन अवस्थितस्य ब्रह्मणः वाक्यान्तरेषु "ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्" इत्यादिषु उपासनादि विधीयते ।

**136.** This truth is elaborately elucidated in the section called Nārāyaṇa Anuvāka (in *Mahā-nārāyaṇopaniṣad*). It commences with 'Thousand-headed god' and proceeds to the text, 'He is Brahmā, he is Śiva, he is Indra, he is Akṣara, He is the highest Svarāṭ'. In the various branches of the scriptures, purporting to describe the supreme Reality, these terms, 'Akṣara, Śiva, Śaṁbhu, Parabrahman Parañjyoti, Paratattva, Parāyaṇa, and Paramātman' are applied to that Reality. Now this section applies all those terms to Nārāyaṇa on the ground, that the attributes which those terms connote, are all found in Nārāyaṇa. It also asserts that all entities other than Nārāyaṇa depend upon him, are pervaded, supported and controlled by him, are subsidiary to him in value and have him as their self. It further treats Brahmā and Śiva as equal to Indra and other minor deities and thus ascribes to them the status of the glory of Nārāyaṇa. This section aims solely at the determinate enunciation of the supreme Being. Nothing else is enjoined in it. The other scriptural sections like the one starting with the sentence 'The knower of Brahman attains the Highest (*Tai. II*, 1)' prescribes meditation etc. on the supreme Brahman, enunciated in this section.

१३७. अतः "प्राणं मनसि सह करणैः" इत्यादिवाक्यं सर्वकारणे परमात्मनि करणप्राणादि सर्वं विकारजातम् उपसंहृत्य, तमेव परमात्मानं सर्वस्य ईशानं ध्यायीत इति, परब्रह्मभूतनारायणस्यैव ध्यानं विदधाति । "पतिं विश्वस्य" "न तस्येशे कश्चन" इति तस्यैव सर्वेशानता प्रतिपादिता । अत एव "सर्वैश्वर्यसम्पन्नः सर्वेश्वरः शम्भुः आकाशमध्ये ध्येयः" इति नारायणस्यैव परमकारणस्य शम्भुशब्दवाच्यस्य ध्यानं विधीयते; "कश्च ध्येयः" इत्यारभ्य "कारणं तु ध्येयः" इति कार्यस्य अध्येयतापूर्वकं कारणैकध्येयतापरत्वात् वाक्यस्य । तस्यैव नारायणस्य परमकारणता शम्भुशब्दवाच्यता च परमकारणप्रतिपादनैकपरे नारायणानुवाक एव प्रतिपन्ना इति, तद्विरोध्यर्थान्तरपरिकल्पनं कारणस्यैव ध्येयत्वविधिवाक्ये न युज्यते ।

**137.** Therefore the text beginning with 'Establishing prāṇa along with the senses on the highest Self (*Atharva*)' etc. inculcates that all effects like prāṇa and the senses must be drawn back to their fundamental cause, the highest Self and that the same highest Self, the Lord of all, must be meditated upon. Thus the meditation on Nārāyaṇa himself, the supreme Brahman, is prescribed in the text. That he is the sovereign of all is brought out in the passages, 'The Master of the universe' and 'There is no ruler over him'. Therefore the injunction, 'Śaṁbhu, the overlord of all, to whom belongs universal sovereignty, must be meditated upon in the centre of the ākāśa (*Atharva.*)' just advocates meditation on Nārāyaṇa, who is the ultimate cause and is designated 'Śaṁbhu'. The basis for this interpretation is that the text opens with the question, 'On what should one meditate?' and offers the answer, 'The cause is to be meditated upon' affirming thereby the unworthiness of the effects to be made the objects of meditation and the exclusive worthiness of the cause to be the object of meditation. Now, the section, Nārāyaṇa Anuvāka, wholly devoted to determining the ultimate cause, makes it clear that Nārāyaṇa is the ultimate

cause and that he is called Śaṁbhu. To put an interpretation on the present passage inculcating meditation on the cause, contrary to Nārāyaṇa Anuvāka which specifies that cause would be wholly unreasonable.

१३८. यदपि "ततो यदुत्तरतरम्" इत्यत्र पुरुषादन्यस्य परतरत्वं प्रतीयते इत्यभ्यधायि, तदपि "यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किञ्चित् यस्मान्नाणीयो न ज्यायोऽस्ति कश्चित्"; "यस्मात् अपरम्" यस्मात् अन्यत् किञ्चिदपि, "परं" नास्ति; केनापि प्रकारेण पुरुषव्यतिरिक्तस्य परत्वं नास्ति इत्यर्थः; अणीयस्त्वं सूक्ष्मत्वं, ज्यायस्त्वं सर्वेश्वरत्वं सर्वव्यापित्वात् सर्वेश्वरत्वात् अस्य, एतद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य कस्यापि अणीयस्त्वं ज्यायस्त्वं च नास्ति इत्यर्थः; "यस्मान्नाणीयो न ज्यायोऽस्ति कश्चित्" इति पुरुषादन्यस्य कस्यापि ज्यायस्त्वं निषिद्धम् इति, तस्मादन्यस्य परत्वं न युज्यते इति प्रत्युक्तम् ।

**138.** The sentence 'That which is superior to him (*tataḥ*) (*Śve. III*, 10)' has been construed as positing an entity higher than the Puruṣa. That construction is ruled out by the following consideration of the text. In the text 'He, other than whom there is none that is great, subtle or big (*Śve. III*, 9)' the clause 'other than whom there is none that is great', means that there is no principle other than this which has any kind of greatness. In the same passage, 'subtlety' means minuteness and 'bigness' means the supremacy over all. Denial of the subtlety and bigness of everything else means that, as this entity is all pervading and all-controlling, there is no entity beside it which is either subtle or big. The clause 'Other than whom there is none that is subtle or big' denies the possibility of any entity other than the puruṣa being great and so, nothing can be higher than Puruṣa. This consideration rules out the supposition in question of an entity higher than the Puruṣa.

१३९. कस्तर्हि अस्य वाक्यस्य अर्थः? अस्य प्रकरणस्योपक्रमे "तमेवं विदित्वातिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय" इति पुरुषवेदनस्य अमृतत्व-

हेतुतां, तद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य अपथतां च प्रतिज्ञाय, "यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किञ्चित्....तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम्" इत्येतदन्तेन पुरुषस्य सर्वस्मात् परत्वं प्रतिपादितम् । यतः पुरुषतत्त्वमेव उत्तरतरं "ततो यदुत्तरतरम्" पुरुषतत्त्वं, तदेव अरूपम् अनामयं, "य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति । अथेतरे दुःखमेवापियन्ति" इति पुरुषवेदनस्य अमृतत्वहेतुत्वं तदितरस्य च अपथत्वं प्रतिज्ञातं सहेतुकमुपसंहृतम् । अन्यथा उपक्रमगतप्रतिज्ञाभ्यां विरुध्यते । पुरुषस्यैव शुद्धि गुणयोगेन शिवशब्दाभिधेयत्वं "शाश्वतं शिवमच्युतम्" इत्यादिना ज्ञातमेव । पुरुष एव शिवशब्दाभिहितः इति अनन्तरमेव वदति "महान् प्रभुर्वै पुरुषः सत्त्वस्यैष प्रवर्तकः" इति । उक्तेनैव न्यायेन "न सन्न चासच्छिव एव केवलः" इत्यादि सर्वं नेयम् ।

**139.** Then what is the purport of the passage in question? The discourse runs thus: In the beginning of the section it is said, 'Knowing only him, one passes beyond death. There is no other way (*Śve. VI*, 15)'. The knowledge of the Puruṣa is stated to be the means for immortality and nothing else is said to lead to that goal. Then beginning with 'Other than whom there is none that is great (*Śve. III*, 9)' and ending with 'By that Puruṣa is all this filled (*Śve. III*, 10) the discourse explains the greatness of the Puruṣa beyond all else. Then the text '*Tataḥ yaduttaratāram*' occurs. It means: Because the Reality, the Puruṣa, is great beyond all else, *therefore* (*tataḥ*) that same great Puruṣa, which is formless and stainless, is such that those who know it become immortal and others sink into sorrow. Thus knowledge of that Puruṣa is the road to immortality and nothing else is. The opening declaration is brought to a reasoned conclusion. On any other interpretation, the (*two*) opening propositions would be nullified. And again, as this Puruṣa is pure, texts like 'Eternal Śiva, imperishable (*Mahā.*)' describe him as 'Śiva'. In the present text also Śiva signifies the Puruṣa. In the further sentence, 'This Puruṣa is the great Lord, the initiator of sattva (*Śve. III*, 12)' the ground for designating him 'Śiva'

is stated. On the same principle other passages like 'There was no being or non-being, Śiva alone existed (*Śve. IV*, 18)' must be explained.

१४०. किञ्च "न तस्येशे कश्चन" इति निरस्तसमाभ्यधिकसम्भावनस्य पुरुषस्य "अणोरणीयान्" इत्यस्मिन्ननुवाके, वेदाद्यन्तरूपतया वेदबीजभूतप्रणवस्य प्रकृतिभूताकारवाच्यतया महेश्वरत्वं प्रतिपाद्य दहरपुण्डरीकमध्यस्थाकाशवर्तितया उपास्यत्वमुक्तम् ।

**140.** Again, in this section of the Upaniṣad, which speaks of the Puruṣa, as one 'over whom no one rules' meaning that it is impossible even to imagine any other being either as equal or superior to the Puruṣa, and as 'subtler than the subtlest', he, the Puruṣa is further on described as the supreme Godhead as he is denoted by the letter 'A' which is the root of the praṇava, which in its turn is the seed of the Vedas, being the foundation as well as the fruition of the Vedas; and the meditation on him is advocated as dwelling in the ākāśa in the centre of the subtle lotus of the heart.

१४१. अयमर्थः—सर्वस्य वेदजातस्य प्रकृतिः प्रणव उक्तः । प्रणवस्य च प्रकृतिः अकारः । प्रणवविकारो वेदः स्वप्रकृतिभूते प्रणवे लीनः । प्रणवोऽपि अकारविकारभूतः स्वप्रकृतौ अकारे लीनः । तस्य प्रणवप्रकृतिभूतस्य अकारस्य यः परः वाच्यः, स एव महेश्वरः इति । सर्ववाचकजातप्रकृतिभूताकारवाच्यः सर्ववाच्यजातप्रकृतिभूतनारायणो यः, सः महेश्वर इत्यर्थः ।

**141.** Its explanation is as follows: The root of all the Vedas is said to be praṇava, the sacred syllable 'Aum'. The root of praṇava is the sacred letter 'A'. The whole of the Veda, being the modification of praṇava, is resolved into praṇava, its cause. Praṇava, the modification of the letter 'A', is resolved into its cause 'A'. He who is named by that 'A' which is the root of praṇava, is the supreme God. The root of all names is 'A' and the root of all entities, that bear

those names, is Nārāyaṇa. This Nārāyaṇa, who is the root of all entities named by the expression which is the root of all names, is the supreme God.

१४२. यथोक्तं भगवता—

अहं कृत्स्नस्य जगतः प्रभवः प्रलयस्तथा ।
मत्तः परतरं नान्यत् किञ्चिदस्ति धनञ्जय ॥

"अक्षराणामकारोऽस्मि" इति ।

"अ इति ब्रह्म" इति च श्रुतेः । "अकारो वै सर्वा वाक्" इति च वाचकजातस्य अकारप्रकृतित्वं, वाच्यजातस्य ब्रह्मप्रकृतित्वं च सुस्पष्टम् । अतः ब्रह्मणः अकारवाच्यताप्रतिपादनात् अकारवाच्यो नारायण एव महेश्वरः इति सिद्धम् ।

**142.** The Lord says,'I am the beginning and the end of the whole universe (*Gītā*, *VII*, 6)', 'There is nothing else higher apart from Myself (*Gītā*, *VII*, 7)' and 'I am the letter "A" among the letters (*Gītā*, *X*, 33)'. The śruti also lays down, '"A" is the designation of Brahman', and 'All speech is "A"'. All speech evolves out of 'A' and all entities constituting the subject-matter of all speech evolves out of Brahman. Therefore, as Brahman is affirmed to be the meaning of 'A', Nārāyaṇa whose name 'A' is, is determined to be the Supreme.

१४३. तस्यैव "सहस्रशीर्षं देवम्" इति केवलपरतत्त्वविशेषप्रतिपादनपरेण नारायणानुवाकेन सर्वस्मात् परत्वं प्रपञ्चितम् । अनेन अनन्यपरेण प्रतिपादितमेव परतत्त्वम्, अन्यपरेषु सर्वेषु वाक्येषु केनापि शब्देन प्रतीयमानं तदेवेति अवगम्यते इति "शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्" इति सूत्रकारेण निर्णीतम् ।

**143.** Of that Nārāyaṇa, transcendent supremacy is predicated in the Nārāyaṇānuvāka, commencing with 'Thousand-headed God', which anuvāka has as its sole purport the determinate characterization and exposition of the ultimate reality. The supreme principle is what is so

determined by this section, which has no other function than such determination. Other sections whose purport is other than this determination, may designate the ultimate principle in other ways, through other terms. The Sūtrakāra, in the aphorism 'The instruction is from the standpoint of the śāstra as in the case of Vāmadeva (*Bra. I, I,* 31)', conveys the decision, that what is named by other names in sections not devoted to the determination of the supreme principle must be taken as one with the principle, which is specifically designated and determined in this section with the sole purport of such specific designation and determination.

१४४. तदेतत् परं ब्रह्म क्वचित् ब्रह्मशिवादिशब्दावगतमिति केवलब्रह्मशिवयोः न परत्वप्रसङ्गः; अस्मिन् अनन्यपरेऽनुवाके तयोरिन्द्रादितुल्यतया तद्विभूतित्वप्रतिपादनात्; क्वचित् आकाशप्राणादिशब्देन परं ब्रह्माभिहितम् इति भूताकाशप्राणादेः यथा न परत्वम् ।

**144.** If this ultimate principle is sometimes referred to as Brahmā or Śiva, it does not prove that the deities Brahmā and Śiva, are the highest reality. That possibility is ruled out in the section, which equates them with Indra etc. and thus assigns to them status of the glories of the ultimate principle, Nārāyaṇa. The exegetical situation is similar to the other, well-established practice (in Vedānta) of not taking the physical ākāśa and prāṇa as the highest principle, just on the ground that some scriptural sections refer to the highest principle as ākāśa and prāṇa.

१४५. यत्पुनरिदमाशङ्कितम् — "अथ यदिदमस्मिन् ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशः तस्मिन् यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यं तद्वाव विजिज्ञासितव्यम्" इत्यत्र आकाशशब्देन जगदुपादानकारणं प्रतिपाद्य, तदन्तर्वर्तिनः कस्यचित् तत्त्वविशेषस्य अन्वेष्टव्यता प्रतिपाद्यते; अस्य आकाशस्य नामरूपयोः निर्वाहकत्वश्रवणात् पुरुषसूक्ते पुरुषस्य नामरूपयोः कर्तृत्वदर्शनाच्च आकाशपर्यायभूतात् पुरुषात् अन्यस्य अन्वेष्टव्यतया उपास्यत्वं प्रतीयते इति ।

**145.** A further objection is raised by the opponent in connection with the section dealing with the meditation on Brahman, as seated in the heart: 'Then in this city of Brahman there is the mansion of the subtle lotus. In this abides the subtle ākāśa. What is in that ākāśa must be searched out, must be investigated (*Chā. VIII, I,* 2)'. Here the term ākāśa stands for the material cause of the world and some other specific principle that dwells in it is held out as the goal of search and investigation. This ākāśa is said to evolve names and forms and in the hymn on the Puruṣa, Puruṣa is declared to be the architect of names and forms. In the present section, therefore, a principle, other than the Puruṣa, the latter being named ākāśa here, is represented as the object of meditation.

१४६. अनधीतवेदानाम् अदृष्टशास्त्रविदाम् इदं चोद्यं, यतः तत्र श्रुतिरेव अस्य परिहारमाह वाक्यकारश्च । "दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशः किं तदत्र विद्यते यदन्वेष्टव्यं यद्वाव विजिज्ञासितव्यम्" इति चोदिते, "यावान्वा-अयमाकाशः तावानेषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः" इत्यादिना अस्य आकाशशब्दवाच्यस्य परमपुरुषस्य अनवधिकमहत्त्वं सकलजगत्कारणतया सकलजगदाधारत्वं प्रतिपाद्य, "तस्मिन् कामाः समाहिताः" इति, अपहतपाप्मत्वादि सत्यकामशब्देन सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वपर्यन्तगुणाष्टकं निहितमिति, परमपुरुषवत् परम-पुरुषगुणाष्टकस्यापि पृथग्विजिज्ञासितव्यताप्रतिपिपादयिषया "तस्मिन् यदन्त-स्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्" इत्युक्तम् इति श्रुत्यैव सर्वं परिहृतम् ।

**146.** Now, this objection could emanate only from those who have not studied the Vedas and not met seers who have comprehended the Vedas. We judge so because the sacred text itself answers the objection and also the commentator, Vākyakāra. To the question, 'What is in that subtle, inner ākāśa which has to be searched out and investigated? (*Chā. VIII, i,* 2)' the answer is provided by the sacred text: 'As extensive as this outer ākāśa is that

inner ākāśa in the heart (*Chā. VIII, i,* 3)'. This brings out that the inner ākāśa by which the supreme Person is meant is of infinite immensity and is the cause and ground of the whole universe. Further the statement 'In it are treasured the desires (*Chā. VIII, i,* 5)' explains that the eightfold perfection of attributes like freedom from sin, the power of fulfilling all desires and will, are treasured in that supreme Person named the 'inner ākāśa'. Thus, just as the supreme Person is to be meditated upon, the eightfold attributes of the supreme Person are also to be made objects of distinct meditation. When the śruti says, 'What is in that is to be searched out, to be investigated (*Chā. VIII, i,* 1)', it is this meditation on the attributes that is commended. Thus all objections are answered by the sacred text itself.

१४७. एतदुक्तं भवति—"किं तदत्र विद्यते यदन्वेष्टव्यम्"—इत्यस्य चोद्यस्य तस्मिन् सर्वस्य जगतः स्रष्टृत्वम् आधारत्वं नियन्तृत्वं शेषित्वम्, अपहतपाप्मत्वादयो गुणाश्च विद्यन्ते इति परिहारः इति। तथा च वाक्यकार-वचनम्—"'तस्मिन् यदन्तः' इति कामव्यपदेशः" इति। काम्यन्ते इति कामाः अपहतपाप्मत्वादयो गुणा इत्यर्थः।

**147.** The substance of the answer to the question 'What is in that, which has to be searched out, to be investigated?' is that in Brahman (represented here as the subtle space in the lotus of the heart) are found existing the perfect attributes like being the creator, the ground, the controller and the master of the whole world and the freedom from imperfections. The Vākyakāra expresses himself to the same effect: "What is in that" means the desires'. By desires are meant what are desired. What are desired are the excellences of attributes, like the absence of imperfection.

१४८. एतदुक्तं भवति—यत् एतत् दहराकाशशब्दाभिधेयम् निखिल-जगदुदयविभवलयलीलं परं ब्रह्म, तस्मिन् यत् अन्तर्निहितम् अनवधिकाति-

शयम् अपहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणाष्टकं, तत् उभयमपि अन्वेष्टव्यं विजिज्ञासितव्यम् इति । यथाऽऽह — "अथ य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान् कामांस्तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति" इति ।

**148.** The passage may be summed up in these words: The supreme Brahman which is designated here as 'the subtle space' is that reality, whose play unfolds itself as the creation, maintenance, and dissolution of the entire cosmos. To that reality belong the eightfold qualitative perfections like the total impossibility of sin and sorrow. Both these—the substantive being of Brahman and its glorious perfections—are to be searched out and investigated. There are concordant texts like the one which says, 'To those who understand here the ātman and his eternal excellences, will accrue freedom in all the worlds (*Chā. VIII, i,* 6)'.

१४९. यः पुनः कारणस्यैव ध्येयताप्रतिपादनपरे वाक्ये विष्णोः अनन्यपरवाक्यप्रतिपादितपरतत्त्वभूतस्य कार्यमध्ये निवेशः, सः स्वकार्यभूततत्त्वसङ्ख्यापूरणं कुर्वतः स्वलीलया जगदुपकाराय स्वेच्छावतारः इत्यवगन्तव्यः; यथा लीलया देवसङ्ख्यापूरणं कुर्वतः उपेन्द्रत्वं परस्यैव; यथा च सूर्यवंशोद्भवराजसङ्ख्यापूरणं कुर्वतः परस्यैव ब्रह्मणो दाशरथिरूपेण स्वेच्छावतारः; यथा च सोमवंशसङ्ख्यापूरणं कुर्वतो भगवतः भूभारावतरणाय स्वेच्छया वसुदेवगृहेऽवतारः; सृष्टिप्रलयप्रकरणेषु नारायण एव परमकारणतया प्रतिपाद्यते इति पूर्वमेवोक्तम् ।

**149.** In some passages directing the seeker to meditate upon the cause of the universe, Viṣṇu, specifically determined as the highest reality in sections meant exclusively for the specific determination of the highest reality, is himself included and enumerated among the effects. That inclusion and enumeration among the effects of that ultimate cause itself is to be understood in terms of the descent of the cause into the realm of the effects, as a matter of voluntary in-

gression, in pure sport, for fulfilling its own effects-series and to accomplish the good of the world. The supreme Lord did become the younger brother of Indra, thereby fulfilling the realm of the gods. He voluntarily descended to the mundane world and became the son of Daśaratha, thereby fulfilling the dynasty of the solar kings. The same Lord took birth in Vasudeva's household voluntarily for removing the burden on earth, thereby fulfiilling the Lunar Dynasty. In the sections devoted specifically to the topic of the creation and disolution of world, Nārāyaṇa alone is represented as the ultimate cause, as previously elucidated.

१५०. यत्पूनः अथर्वशिरसि रुद्रेण स्वसर्वैश्वर्यं प्रपञ्चितं, तत् "सोऽन्तरादन्तरं प्राविशत्" इति परमात्मप्रवेशादुक्तम् इति श्रुत्यैव व्यक्तम् । "शास्त्र दृष्टया तूपदेशो वामदेववत्" इति सूत्रकारेण एवमादीनाम् अर्थः प्रतिपादितः ।

**150.** In the Upaniṣad called Atharvaśiras, Rudra expatiates upon his universal greatness and glory. That has to be understood as a speech grounded on the fact of Brahman entering into all beings as their soul. The text itself clarifies the whole position by saying, 'He entered the inmost recess'. The law governing the right interpretation of all such texts has been laid down by the author of the *Sutras*, 'The instruction is from the standpoint of the śāstras as in the case of Vāmadeva (*I*, *i*, 31)'.

१५१. यथोक्तं प्रह्लादेनापि —

सर्वगत्वादनन्तस्य स एवाहमवस्थितः ।
मत्तस्सर्वमहं सर्वं मयि सर्वं सनातने ॥ इत्यादि ।

अत्र "सर्वगत्वादनन्तस्य" इति हेतुरुक्तः; स्वशरीरभूतस्य सर्वस्य चिदचिद्वस्तुनः आत्मत्वेन सर्वगतः परमात्मा इति सर्वे शब्दाः सर्वशरीरं परमात्मानमेव अभिदधतीत्युक्तम् । अतः "अहम्" इति शब्दः स्वात्मप्रकारिणं परमात्मानमेव आचष्टे ।

**151.** Even Prahlāda proclaims, 'As the infinite one is all-pervading, I am he, all things arise out of me and they all dwell in me, the primeval one (*Vi. I, XIX*, 85)'. Here the basis for such a proclamation is given clearly by the clause, 'As the infinite one is all-pervading'. As the highest Self pervades all beings, sentient and non-sentient, and as they form his body, all terms denote him, whose body all these entities are. Therefore the term 'I' signifies the Paramātman of whom the individual self is a mode.

**१५१.** अतः इदमुच्यते "आत्मेत्येव तु गृह्णीयात् सर्वस्य तन्निष्पत्तेः" इत्यादिना अहङ्ग्रहणोपासनं वाक्यकारेण; कार्यावस्थः कारणावस्थश्च स्थूल-सूक्ष्मचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरः परमात्मैव इति "सर्वस्य तन्निष्पत्तेः" इत्युक्तम् । "आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च" इति सूत्रकारेण च ।

**152.** It is for this reason that the Vākyakāra holds, 'One should grasp it as one's own ātman, for all emanates from it', and thus advocates the meditation on Brahman as the 'ego'. All entities—individual selves and physical forms—both in unmanifested and manifested states are constitutive of the body of the highest Self. So it is that itself which exists as cause and effect. He alone is thus embodied in all conditions. The Vākyakāra brings out the reason in the words, 'For all emanates from it'. The Sūtrakāra has formulated the idea in the *Sūtra*, 'The seekers meditate on him as the self and the scriptures teach him as the self (*IV, i,* 3)'.

**१५२.** महाभारते च ब्रह्मरुद्रसंवादे ब्रह्मा रुद्रं प्रत्याह — "तवान्तरात्मा मम च ये चान्ये देहिसंज्ञिताः" इति । रुद्रस्य ब्रह्मणश्च अन्येषां च देहिनां परमेश्वरो नारायणः अन्तरात्मतयावस्थितः इति ।

तथा तत्रैव —

विष्णुरात्मा भगवतो भवस्यामिततेजसः ।
तस्माद्धनुर्ज्यासंस्पर्शं स विषेहे महेश्वरः ॥ इति ।

तत्रैव —

एतौ द्वौ विबुधश्रेष्ठौ प्रसादक्रोधजौ स्मृतौ ।
तदादर्शितपन्थानौ सृष्टिसंहारकारकौ ॥ इति ।

अन्तरात्मतया अवस्थितनारायणदर्शितपथौ ब्रह्मरुद्रौ सृष्टिसंहारकार्यकरौ इत्यर्थः ।

**153.** In the *Mahābhārata* Brahmā addressed these words to Rudra: 'Your inner self, my inner self, and the inner self of all embodied beings is the supreme Lord, Nārāyaṇa (*Mokṣa. CLXXIX*, 4)'. The supreme Lord Nārāyaṇa exists as the inner self of Rudra, Brahmā and all other embodied beings. And in the same work these further passages are found: 'Viṣṇu is the ātman of the blessed Bhava, possessing unlimited energy. He withstood therefore the touch of that bow-string (*Karṇa. XXXV*, 50).' Again, these two are the best of the celestials. They are born of favour and anger. They are shown the way by him and bring about creation and destruction (*Mokṣa. CLXIX*, 19)'. It means that Nārāyaṇa, who dwells in them as their inner soul, shows them the way and thus they, Brahmā and Rudra, become the creator and destroyer respectively.

१५४. निमित्तोपादानयोस्तु भेदं वदन्तः वेदबाह्या एव स्युः — "जन्माद्यस्य यतः", "प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्" इत्यादिवेदवित्प्रणीतसूत्रविरोधात्; "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् एकमेवाद्वितीयम्", "ब्रह्मवनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत् यतो द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः, ब्रह्माध्यतिष्ठद्भुवनानि धारयन्", "सर्वे निमेषा जज्ञिरे विद्युतः पुरुषादधि", "न तस्येशे कश्चन तस्य नाम महद्यशः", "नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन", "सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः", "पुरुष एवेदं सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भव्यम्", "उतामृतत्वस्येशानः", "नान्यः पन्था अयनाय विद्यते" इत्यादिसर्वश्रुतिगणविरोधाच्च ।

**154.** Those who posit that the material cause and the efficient cause are different entities, are outside the pale of

the Vedas. They would be flagrantly contradicting the *Sūtras* framed by the knower of Vedas; as, 'That from which the origin etc. of the world proceed (*Bra. I, I,* 2)' and 'It is the material cause in accordance with the opening declaration and the illustrations advanced (*Bra. I, iv,* 23)'. All the aggregates of śruti passages also would negate that position; such as, 'Being alone, all this was in the beginning, one only, without a second (*Chā. VI, ii,* 1)'; 'Brahman is the forest and Brahman is the tree, out of which they fashioned the earth and the sky. He stood on Brahman, sustaining the world. (*Tai. Brāhmaṇa, II, viii,* 9)'; 'All moments of time, originated from the Puruṣa with the brilliance of lightning (*Mahā.*)'; 'No one rules over him, his fame is indeed great (*Mahā.* )'; 'There is no plurality here (*Bṛ. VI, iv,* 19)'; 'He is the controller of all, the Lord of all (*Bṛ. VI, iv,* 22)'; 'Puruṣa is all this, whatever is past and whatever is future. He is the Lord of immortality. There is no other way to the Goal (*Pu.* 2-4)'.

१५५. इतिहासपुराणेषु च सृष्टिप्रलयप्रकरणयोरिदमेव परतत्त्वमित्यवगम्यते । यथा महाभारते—

केन सृष्टमिदं सर्वं जगत् स्थावरजङ्गमम् ।
प्रलये च कमभ्येति तन्मे ब्रूहि पितामह ॥ इति पृष्टः,
नारायणो जगन्मूर्तिः अनन्तात्मा सनातनः । इत्यादि च वदन्
ऋषयः पितरो देवा महाभूतानि धातवः ।
जङ्गमाजङ्गमञ्चेदं जगन्नारायणोद्भवम् ॥ इति च ।

**155.** Passing on to itihāsa and purāṇas, in the sections relating to the creation and destruction of the universe, an identical conclusion is reached on the question of the ultimate godhead. These questions are raised in the *Mahābhārata:* 'Whence is the creation of this world of moving and non-moving entities? Whither does it go at dissolution? Instruct me in this matter O, Sire (*Mokṣa. CLXXXI,* 1)'. They are

answered by the grandfather, Bhīṣma: Nārāyaṇa, whose form the universe is, is the infinite self, the eternal one (*Mokṣa. CLXXXI*, 12)' and 'The sages, the manes, the gods, the great elements, the minerals, and in short, this whole universe, consisting of moving and non-moving entities originates from Nārāyaṇa (*Ānu.* 229)'.

१५६. प्राच्योदीच्यदाक्षिणात्यपाश्चात्यसर्वशिष्टैः सर्वधर्मसर्वतत्त्वव्यवस्थायाम् इदमेव पर्याप्तमित्यविगानपरिगृहीतं वैष्णवं च पुराणम्। "जन्माद्यस्य यतः" इति जगज्जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्मेत्यवगम्यते। तत् जन्मादिकारणं किमिति प्रश्नपूर्वकं "विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूतम्" इत्यादिना ब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेषप्रतिपादनैकपरतया प्रवृत्तम् इति सर्वसम्मतम्। तथा तत्रैव —

प्रकृतिर्या मयाख्याता व्यक्ताव्यक्तस्वरूपणी।
पुरुषश्चाप्युभावेतौ लीयेते परमात्मनि ॥
परमात्मा च सर्वेषाम् आधारः परमेश्वरः।
विष्णुनामा स वेदेषु वेदान्तेषु च गीयते ॥ इति।

सर्ववेदवेदान्तेषु सर्वैः शब्दैः परमकारणतया अयमेव गीयते इत्यर्थः।

**156.** The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* has been unanimously adopted by all the great sages, from the East, West, North and South, as an all-sufficient authority for the ascertainment of all righteous conduct and Reality. On the authority of the aphorism, 'Whence the origin etc. of this (*Bra. I, i,* 2)', Brahman is understood to be the cause of creation etc. of the universe. Now, the purāṇa in question, opens with a clear statement of the question as to what constitutes the source of the creation etc. of the universe and proceeds to answer, 'From Viṣṇu is all this born (*Vi. I, i,* 31)'. All agree on the point that such a procedure proves that the work has as its sole purpose the exposition of the specific character of Brahman. In the same text we have the statement, 'She, who has been named prakṛti by me, has both a manifest form and unmanifest form. Both she and the puruṣa (individual self)

dissolve in the Paramātman. Paramātman is the supporting ground of all and is the supreme godhead. He is sung in the Veda, as well as Vedānta, as Viṣṇu (*Vi. VI. iv*, 39)'. In all the Vedas and Upaniṣads, he is sung as the ultimate cause through all modes of expression.

१५७. यथा सर्वासु श्रुतिषु केवलपरब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेषप्रतिपादनायैव प्रवृत्तो नारायणानुवाकः, तथा इदं वैष्णवं च पुराणम् —

सोऽहमिच्छामि धर्मज्ञ श्रोतुं त्वत्तो यथा जगत् ।
बभूव भूयश्च यथा महाभाग भविष्यति ॥
यन्मयं चजगत् ब्रह्मन् यतश्चैतच्चाराचरम् ॥
लीनमासीद्यथा यत्र लयमेष्यति यत्र च ॥ इति ।

परं ब्रह्म किमिति प्रक्रम्य,

विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूतं जगत्तत्रैव च स्थितम् ।
स्थितिसंयमकर्तासौ जगतोऽस्य जगच्च सः ॥
परः पराणां परमः परमात्मात्मसंस्थितः ।
रूपवर्णादिनिर्देशविशेषणविवर्जितः ॥
अपक्षयविनाशाभ्यां परिणामर्द्धिजन्मभिः ।
वर्जितः शक्यते वक्तुं यः सदास्तीति केवलम् ॥
सर्वत्रासौ समस्तं च वसत्यत्रेति वै यतः ।
ततस्स वासुदेवेति विद्वद्भिः परिपठ्यते ॥
तद्ब्रह्म परमं नित्यम् अजमक्षयमव्ययम् ।
एकस्वरूपं च सदा हेयाभावाच्च निर्मलम् ।
तदेव सर्वमेवैतत् व्यक्ताव्यक्तस्वरूपवत् ।
तथा पुरुषरूपेण कालरूपेण च स्थितम् ॥
स सर्वभूतप्रकृतिं विकारान् गुणादिदोषांश्च मुने व्यतीतः ।
अतीतसर्वावरणोऽखिलात्मा तेनास्तृतं यद्भुवनान्तराले ॥
समस्तकल्याणगुणात्मकोऽसौ स्वशक्तिलेशोद्धृतभूतवर्गः ।
इच्छागृहीताभिमतोरुदेहः संसाधिताशेषजगद्धितोऽसौ ॥
तेजोबलैश्वर्यमहावबोधस्ववीर्यशक्त्यादिगुणैकराशिः ।

परः पराणां सकला न यत्र क्लेशादयस्सन्ति परावरेशे ॥
स ईश्वरो व्यष्टिसमष्टिरूपः व्यक्तस्वरूपोऽप्रकटस्वरूपः ।
सर्वेश्वरः सर्वदृक् सर्ववेत्ता समस्तशक्तिः परमेश्वराख्यः ॥
संज्ञायते येन तदस्तदोषं शुद्धं परं निर्मलम् एकरूपम् ।
सन्दृश्यते वाप्यधिगम्यते वा तज्ज्ञानमज्ञानमतोऽन्यदुक्तम् ॥

इति, परब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेषनिर्णयायैव प्रवृत्तम् ।

**147.** Even as among all the srutis, the *Nārāyaṇānuvāka*, has as its sole aim the specific determination of nature of Brahman, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* is also a work solely devoted to that particular end. It opens with these questions (*I*, *i*, 4-5): 'O Knower of dharma, I desire to hear from you how this world was and how it will be in future. By what is this world filled? Whence are these moving and non-moving beings? By what is it brought to dissolution and into what does it dissolve?' The question in essence is 'What is Brahman?' The answer making a decisive declaration of the nature of Brahman follows. 'The universe originates from Viṣṇu and exists in him. He is its maintainer and controller. He is the world. He is greater than the greatest. He is supreme. He is the Paramātman. He dwells in the selves. He is beyond all characterizations in terms of form, colour, etc. He is beyond decay and cessation, beyond modification, increase and characterizations in terms of foims, colour, etc. He is beyond birth. He can be desciibed only as the 'Ever-existent'. He dwells in all and all things dwell in him. Therefore the wise name him 'Vāsudeva'. He is the supreme Brahman, eternal, unborn, imperishable and undecaying. He is always of the self-same form, free from evil, and thus pure. He is all this and has both this manifested and unmanifested as his form. And also he exists as the individual spirit and time (*Vi. II*, *i*, 1-14). He transcends, O Sage, the character of all material elements, all mutations and all qualities of nature, which are essentially imperfections. He is beyond all obscuration of

ignorance. He is the soul of all and by him was spread out whatever is contained in the universe. He is of the nature of all auspicious attributes. By a tiny fragment of his power the aggregates of beings are lifted up. He assumes by his own desire a multiplicity of bodies. Thus he accomplishes the good of the whole world. He is a mass of only excellences like radiance, power, rulership, omniscience, vigour and strength. He is greater than the greatest. Not one of the imperfections like affliction ever approach him. He is the sovereign of the high and low. He is the Lord. He has the sumtotal of all subtle entities as his form. The gross universe is also his form. He is of the unmanifested form and manifested form. He is the Lord of all. He sees all. He knows all. He is all-powerful. He is the supreme God. That by which this pure, taintless, transcendent, faultless and undivided and sole reality is cognized, perceived and realized, is the only knowledge. All other processes of cogitation are mere ignorance (*Vi. VI, v*, 83-87)'. Thus the (*Viṣṇupurāṇa*) exhibits itself as meant solely for the declaration of the determinate identity of the supreme Brahman.

१५८. अन्यानि सर्वपुराणानि अन्यपराणि एतदविरोधेन नेयानि । अन्यपरत्वं च तत्तदारम्भप्रकारैः अवगम्यते; सर्वात्मना विरुद्धांशः तामसत्वात् अनादरणीयः ।

**158.** All other purāṇas with other aims must be interpreted consistently with this purāṇa. That they have other aims is discerned in the manner of their commencement. Whatever is found in them, altogether inconsistent with this purāṇa must be set aside as being of the nature of tamas.

१५९. नन्वस्मिन्नपि,

सृष्टिस्थित्यन्तकारिणीं ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवात्मिकाम् ।
स संज्ञां याति भगवान् एक एव जनार्दनः ॥

इति त्रिमूर्तिसाम्यं प्रतीयते ।

नैतदेवम्; "एक एव जनार्दनः" इति जनार्दनस्यैव ब्रह्मशिवादिकृत्स्न-प्रपञ्चतादात्म्यं विधीयते ।

"जगच्च सः" इति पूर्वोक्तमेव विवृणोति—

स्रष्टा सृजति चात्मानं विष्णुः पाल्यं च पाति च ।
उपसंह्रियते चान्ते संहर्ता च स्वयं प्रभुः ॥

इति स्रष्टृत्वेन अवस्थितं ब्रह्माणं सृज्यं च, संहर्तारं संहार्यं च, युगपन्निर्दिश्य सर्वस्य विष्णुतादात्म्योपदेशात्; सृज्यसंहार्यभूतात् वस्तुनः स्रष्टृसंहर्त्रोः जनार्दनविभूतित्वेन विशेषो दृश्यते । जनार्दनविष्णुशब्दयोः पर्यायत्वेन "ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवात्मिकाम्" इति विभूतिमत एव स्वेच्छया लीलार्थं विभूत्यन्तर्भाव उच्यते ।

**159.** (**Objection**): But in this purāṇa, the equality in status of the three deities Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva is put forth. 'That same Bhagavān Janārdana assumes three names, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, by virtue of the three functions of creation, maintenance and destruction (*Vi. I, ii,* 66)'.

(**Reply**): If this be said, we answer that such is not the case. The unity of Janārdana, who is referred to by the expression 'the same Janārdana' with the whole universe commencing with Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva is asserted here. What was stated previously in the proposition, 'He is the world (*Vi. I, i,* 31)' is expanded thus: 'The same Lord as creator creates himself, as Viṣṇu protects all that is to be protected and as destroyer, he withdraws into himself (*Vi. I, ii,* 67)'. Both the creator and the created, the destroyer and the destroyed are together taken up and the unity of all with Viṣṇu is proclaimed. The creator and the destroyer are treated as of the same status as the created existence and the objects of destruction, in the matter of being the manifestations of Janārdana. When it is said that Janārdana assumes three names and forms as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva (*Vi. I, II,* 66), because the terms Janārdana and Viṣṇu are synonyms,

the Lord, whose manifestation all things are, is said to enter into the realm of his own manifestations and become included among his own glories. This is an act of his own choice and constitutes his own play.

१६०. यथेदमनन्तरमेवोच्यते —

पृथिव्यापस्तथा तेजः वायुराकश एव च ।
सर्वेन्द्रियान्तःकरणं पुरुषाख्यं हि यज्जगत् ॥
स एव सर्वभूतात्मा विश्वरूपो यतोऽव्ययः ।
सर्गादिकं ततोऽस्यैव भूतस्थमुपकारकम् ॥
स एव सृज्यः स च सर्गकर्ता स एव पात्यत्ति च पाल्यते च ।
ब्रह्माद्यवस्थाभिरशेषमूर्तिर्विष्णुर्वरिष्ठो वरदो वरेण्यः ॥ इति ।

**160.** This position is further developed: 'The earth, the waters, fire, the air, the space, all the senses, the mind and the individual self and in short the world as a whole, is he. He is the soul of all beings, and the universe is his form, as he is imperishable. The processes like creation that happen to entities are for his sake. He is the creature and he is the author of creation. He protects, withdraws and is what is protected. Viṣṇu, the excellent one, the beneficient one, the adorable one, is of universal form as he assumes states like that of Brahmā (*Vi. I, ii*, 68-70)'.

१६१. अत्र सामानाधिकरण्यनिर्दिष्टं हेयमिश्रप्रपञ्चतादात्म्यं निरवद्यस्य निर्विकारस्य समस्तकल्याणगुणाकारस्य ब्रह्मणः कथमुपपद्यते इत्याशङ्क्य, "स एव सर्वभूतात्मा विश्वरूपो यतोऽव्ययः" इति स्वयमेव उपपादयति । "स एव" सर्वेश्वरेश्वरः परब्रह्मभूतो विष्णुरेव, "जगत्" इति प्रतिज्ञाय, "सर्वभूतात्मा विश्वरूपो यतोऽव्ययः" इति हेतुरुक्तः । सर्वभूतानाम् अयमात्मा विश्वशरीरो "यतोऽव्ययः" इत्यर्थः । वक्ष्यति च "तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः" इति । एतदुक्तं भवति — अस्य अव्ययस्यापि परस्य ब्रह्मणः विष्णोः विश्वशरीरतया तादात्म्यमविरुद्धम् इति । आत्मशरीरयोश्च स्वभावाः व्यवस्थिता एव ।

**161.** Here the oneness of all with him is asserted. The question would arise as to how he, free from evil and change and abounding in all auspicious excellences, could be one with the world which is mixed up with evil. The position is explained in the text itself, 'He is the soul of all beings. He has the universe as his form, as he is imperishable (*Vi. I, II*, 68)' The text first states that the same Viṣṇu, who is supreme Brahman, the Sovereign of soveriegns, is the world. Then it adds the reason for that conclusion by saying, 'He is the soul of all beings, and the universe is his form, as he is imperishable'. It means that he is the soul of all beings, and has the universe as his form, because he is imperishable. Further on the same truth is stated, 'All that is the body of Hari (*Vi. I, xxii*, 38)'. The fundamental idea is that though Viṣṇu, the supreme Brahman is imperishable, there is nothing contradictory in his being one with the universe in the sense of having it as his body. The distinctive characteristics of the body and soul remain unmodified.

१६२. एवम्भूतस्य सर्वेश्वरस्य विष्णोः प्रपञ्चान्तर्भूतनियाम्यकोटिनिविष्ट-ब्रह्मादिदेवतिर्यङ्मनुष्येषु तत्तत्समाश्रयणीयत्वाय स्वेच्छावतारः पूर्वोक्तः । तदेतत् ब्रह्मादीनां भावनात्रयान्वयेन कर्मवश्यत्वम्, भगवतः परब्रह्मभूतस्य वासुदेवस्य निखिलजगदुपकाराय स्वेच्छया स्वेनैव रूपेण देवादिषु अवतार इति च षष्ठेंऽशे शुभाश्रयप्रकरणे सुव्यक्तमुक्तम् । अस्य देवादिरूपेण अवतारेष्वपि न प्राकृतो देहः इति महाभारते "न भूतसङ्घसंस्थानो देहोऽस्य परमात्मनः" इति प्रतिपादितः ।

**162.** And this supreme Viṣṇu descends by his own choice into the created world and becomes one among the dependent creatures like gods, animals and men beginning with Brahmā. This descent among the creatures on the status of equality with them is for making himself accessible to them in order to facilitate their coming to him for support. This conception of avatār has already been expounded. In the sixth chapter

of *Viṣṇupurāṇa* dealing with question of the proper object of meditation, which should be at once holy as well as accessible, the whole position is clarified. There it is pointed out that beings like Brahmā are associated with the three inner efforts (*i.e.*, karma-bhāvana, brahma-bhāvana and both) and therefore are subject to karma. It is established there that the supreme Vāsudeva, the highest Brahman, descends in his own form, by his own choice, for working out the good of the world, into the world of beings like gods and men. *Māhābhārata* says that his body is not physical, even in incarnations. 'The body of this supreme Self is not a structure compounded of physical elements'.

१६३. श्रुतिश्च "अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते तस्य धीराः परिजानन्ति योनिम्" इति । कर्मवश्यानां ब्रह्मादीनामनिच्छतामपि तत्तत्कर्मानुगुणप्रकृतिपरिणामभूतसङ्घसंस्थानविशेषदेवादिशरीरप्रवेशरूपं जन्म अवर्जनीयम्; अयं तु सर्वेश्वरः सत्यसङ्कल्पः भगवान् एवम्भूतशुभेतरजन्म अकुर्वन्नपि, स्वेच्छया स्वेनैव निरतिशयकल्याणरूपेण देवादिषु जगदुपकाराय बहुधा जायते; तस्यैतस्य शुभेतरजन्म अकुर्वतोऽपि सर्वकल्याणगुणानन्त्येन "बहुधा योनिम्" बहुविधजन्म, "धीरा" धीमतामग्रेसराः जानन्ति इत्यर्थः ।

**163.** The śruti also says, 'The birthless One takes many births. The wise ones comprehend his birth (*Pu.* 21)'. Brahmā and other individual selves, being subject to karma, are compelled to take birth in physical bodies, structure compounded of physical elements, in accordance with their karma. This is inevitable for them, even if they were to be unwilling to be re-incarnated. But in the case of the Lord, whose will perfectly fulfils itself, and is the controller of all, there is no evil birth of this nature. On the contrary, by his own desire, in his own supremely holy form, he takes many births among gods, men, etc. for the purpose of effecting the good of the world. Though he does not take births other

than the good, out of the infinity of his auspicious qualities, he takes 'many births' i.e., multiplicity of births. 'The wise ones' i.e., the supremely intelligent ones comprehend (this).

१६४. तदेतन्निखिलजगन्निमित्तोपादानभूतात् "जन्माद्यस्य यतः", "प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्" इत्यादिसूत्रैः प्रतिपादितात् परस्मान् ब्रह्मणः परमपुरुषात् अन्यस्य कस्यचित् परत्वम् — "परमतस्सेतून्मानसम्बन्धभेदव्यपदेशेभ्यः" इत्याशङ्क्य, "सामान्यात्तु", "बुद्ध्यर्थः पादवत्", "स्थानविशेषात् प्रकाशादिवत्", "उपपत्तेश्च", "तथान्यप्रतिषेधात्", "अनेन सर्वगतत्वमायामशब्दादिभ्यः" इति सूत्रकारः स्वयमेव निराकरोति ।

**164.** The Sūtrakāra, first of all, declares that Brahman is the material and efficient cause of the world in the aphorisms, 'That from which the origin etc. of this world proceed (*Bra. I, i*, 2)' and 'He is the material cause also, in accordance with the opening declaration and the illustrations advanced (*Bra, I, iv*, 23)'. He formulates the *prima facie* view that there is some principle transcending and surpassing the highest Brahman, the supreme Person so defined, in the following aphorism: 'There is something higher than that; on account of the designation of bridge, measure, connection and difference (*Bra. III, ii*, 30)'. Then he himself refutes that view in the following aphorisms: 'But on account of resemblance (*Bra. III, ii*, 31)'. 'It subserves the purpose of thought; as in the case of feet (*Bra. III, ii*, 32)', 'Owing to difference of place as in the case of light and so on (*Bra. III, ii*, 33)', 'And on account of possibility (*Bra. III, ii*, 34),' 'Thus, from the denial of anything else (*Bra. III, ii*, 35),' 'The omnipresence (possessed) by that, (understood) from the declaration of extent (*Bra. III, ii*, 36).'

१६५. मानवे च शास्त्रे — "प्रादुरासीत्तमोनुदः", "सिसृक्षुः विविधाः प्रजाः", "अप एव ससर्जादौ तासु वीर्यमपासृजत्", "तस्मिन् जज्ञे स्वयं ब्रह्म" इति, ब्रह्मणो जन्मश्रवणात् क्षेत्रज्ञत्वमेव अवगम्यते; तथा च स्रष्टुत्रः

परमपुरुषस्य, तद्विसृष्टस्य च ब्रह्मणः "अयनं तस्य ताः पूर्वं तेन नारायणः स्मृतः", "तद्विसृष्टः स पुरुषः लोके ब्रह्मेति कीर्त्यते" इति नामनिर्देशाच्च ।

**165.** So also in the scripture from Manu we learn as follows: 'The impeller of darkness (*mūla-prakṛti*) manifested (*Ma. I*, 6);' 'Desirous of creating the creatures (*Ma. I*, 7);' 'He first created the waters and scattered over them the potency (*Ma. I*, 8);' 'There Brahmā took birth (*Ma. I*, 9).' The birth of Brahmā is thus narrated. That makes it clear that Brahmā is an individual self. Further on the distinct designations of the supreme Person, the creator, and of Brahmā, the creature projected by him are given: 'They were his abode in the beginning. So he is known as "Nārāyaṇa" (*Ma. I*, 10);' 'That person, who was projected by him, is known as "Brahmā" in the world (*Ma. I*, 11)'.

१६६. तथा वैष्णवे पुराणे हिरण्यगर्भादीनां भावनात्रयान्वयात् अशुद्धत्वेन शुभाश्रयत्वानर्हत्वोपपादनात् क्षेत्रज्ञत्वं निश्चीयते ।

**166.** Similarly *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, by maintaining that the gods like Hiraṇyagarbha, being associated with the three bhāvanās and hence being impure, are not fit to be taken as the 'holy supports' for meditation, works out the conclusion that they are mere individual selves.

१६७. यदपि कैश्चिदुक्तम्—सर्वस्य शब्दजातस्य विध्यर्थवादमन्त्ररूपस्य कार्याभिधायित्वेनैव प्रामाण्यं वर्णनीयम्; व्यवहारादन्यत्र शब्दस्य बोधकत्व-शक्त्यवधारणासम्भवात्, व्यवहारस्य च कार्यबुद्धिमूलत्वात् कार्यरूप एव शब्दार्थः; न परिनिष्पन्ने वस्तुनि शब्दः प्रमाणम् इति ।

**167.** Another view (concerning the correct interpretation of the Vedas) has been upheld by some thinkers. Their main contention is this: The whole body of the Vedas, consisting of injunctions, explanations and hymns must be expounded as conveying ideas as to what is to be done by way of action. It is impossible to apprehend the meaning

of words except in connection with action. Action springs from the consciousness of something to be accomplished. Therefore words have only the idea of something to be accomplished as their meaning. From this it follows that nothing that is an accomplished reality can be revealed by verbal testimony.

१६८. अत्रोच्यते—प्रवर्तकवाक्यव्यवहार एव शब्दानामर्थबोधकत्वशक्त्यवधारणं कर्तव्यमिति किमियं राजाज्ञा? सिद्धवस्तुषु शब्दस्य बोधकत्वशक्तिग्रहणम् अत्यन्तसुकरम्। तथा हि—केनचित् हस्तचेष्टादिना "अपवरके दण्डः स्थितः" इति देवदत्ताय ज्ञापयेति प्रेषितः कश्चित् तज्ज्ञापने प्रवृत्तः, "अपवरके दण्डः स्थितः" इति शब्दं प्रयुङ्क्ते। मूकवत् हस्तचेष्टामिमां जानन् पार्श्वस्थोऽन्यः प्रागव्युत्पन्नोऽपि, एतस्यार्थस्य बोधनाय "अपवरके दण्डः स्थितः" इत्यस्य शब्दस्य प्रयोगदर्शनात् "अस्य अर्थस्य अयं शब्दो बोधकः" इति जानाति इति किमत्र दुष्करम्।

**168.** We reply as follows: That the meaning of words must be grasped only in the context of sentences including action is not an absolute rule. It is being insisted upon by the opponent as if it were a royal order. As a matter of fact it is very easy to make out that words have power of denoting existing entities. Suppose a person tells another person by means of gesture that the latter must tell Devadatta that 'the staff is to be found in the inner apartment'. Accordingly the second person proceeds to Devadatta and communicates to him the message not by gestures but by actual words. A fourth person is witnessing the whole proceeding from the first gesture-communication of the first person to the second person and latter's discharge of his commission. We have to suppose him to be ignorant of the meaning of the words to start with and he has all along watched the proceeding like a dumb person. He understands the significance of the gestures of the first man and hears the words

of the second man addressed to Devadatta. He apprehends that the meaning conveyed through the first person's gestures is the meaning of the words spoken by the second, 'The staff is to be found in the inner apartment'. What is the difficulty in understanding the existential import of words here?

१६९. तथा बालः "ततोऽयम्, इयमम्बा, अयं मातुलः, अयं मनुष्यः, अयं मृगः, चन्द्रोऽयम्, अयं च सर्पः" इति मातापितृप्रभृतिभिः शब्दैः शनैः शनैः अङ्गुल्या निर्देशेन तत्र तत्र बहुशः शिक्षितः, तैरेव शब्दैः तेष्वर्थेषु स्वात्मनश्च बुद्धयुत्पत्तिं दृष्ट्वा, तेष्वर्थेषु तेषां शब्दानाम् अङ्गुल्या निर्देशपूर्वकप्रयोगः संबन्धान्तराभावात् सङ्केतयितृपुरुषाज्ञानाच्च बोधकत्वनिबन्धनः इति क्रमेण निश्चित्य, पुनरपि "अस्य शब्दस्य अयमर्थः" इति पूर्ववृद्धैः शिक्षितः, सर्वशब्दानामर्थमवगम्य स्वयमपि सर्वं वाक्यजातं प्रयुङ्क्ते । एवमेव सर्वपदानां स्वार्थाभिधायित्वं, सङ्घातविशेषाणां च यथावस्थितसंसर्गविशेषबोधकत्वं च जानाति इति, कार्यार्थे एव व्युत्पत्तिः इत्यादिनिर्बन्धो निर्निबन्धनः ।

**169.** (The way children learn language is this). The child is trained gradually by the parents and elders by being shown persons and things and by the utterance at the same time of words like 'This is father', 'This is mother', 'This is uncle', 'This is a man', 'This is the moon' and 'This is a serpent'. This the elders do gradually and frequently. Afterwards whenever the child hears those words again, its mind recalls the meanings. It also makes out that things and persons were pointed out and the words were uttered, because the words are naturally the names of those persons and things, especially as there is no other possible relation between those words and things and as no particular convention is known to have been made by any individual to that effect. Thus gradually realizing and again receiving training from elders, it learns the meaning of all words. It itself begins to use language. It is thus that words acquire their determinate denotations, and groups of words come to represent

particular relations of facts. Thus the regulation that all words acquire meaning in the context of action and imperatives has no foundation.

१७०. अतः परिनिष्पन्ने वस्तुनि शब्दस्य बोधकत्वशक्त्यवधारणात् सर्वाणि वेदान्तवाक्यानि सकलजगत्कारणं सर्वकल्याणगुणाकरम् उक्तलक्षणं ब्रह्म बोधयन्त्येव ।

**170.** Therefore, as language is quite capable of conveying information about accomplished facts, all the texts of the Upaniṣads impart knowledge about Brahman, the cause of the universe and the repository of all excellences, as previously interpreted.

१७१. अपि च कार्यार्थे एव व्युत्पत्तिरस्तु; वेदान्तवाक्यानि उपासनविषयकार्याधिकृतविशेषणभूतफलत्वेन, दुःखासम्भिन्नदेशविशेषरूपस्वर्गादिवत्, रात्रिसत्रप्रतिष्ठादिवत्, अपगोरणशतयातनासाध्यसाधनभाववच्च, कार्योपयोगितयैव सर्वं बोधयन्ति ।

**171.** Further, let us even admit that all words convey ideas of what is to be accomplished. Vedānta texts inculcate action in the form of meditation and actually teach all else in enunciation of what accrues as a result of such meditation to persons on whom the injunction to meditate is imposed as an aid to meditations to be performed. This is so in the case of the injunction to sacrifice, which injunction is coupled with the information concerning heaven as an abode free from sorrow. This is so in the case of the injunction of night-sacrifice, to which is added the positive information about the great status that accrues to the performer of the said sacrifice. The prohibition of threatening a Brāhmaṇa is conveyed along with the definite positive information about the means-and-end relationship subsisting between the non-observance of that prohibition and the imposition of the penalty of a fine of one hundred gold pieces.

१७२. तथा हि — "ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्" इत्यत्र ब्रह्मोपासनविषय-कार्याधिकृतविशेषणभूतफलत्वेन ब्रह्मप्राप्तिः श्रूयते, परप्राप्तिकामो ब्रह्म विद्यात् इति । अत्र प्राप्यतया प्रतीयमानं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं तद्विशेषणं च सर्वं कार्योप-योगितयैव सिद्धिं भवति; तदन्तर्गतमेव जगतः स्रष्टृत्वं संहर्तृत्वम् आधारत्वम् अन्तरात्मत्वम् इत्याद्युक्तम्, अनुक्तं च सर्वमिति, न किञ्चिदनुपपन्नम् । एवं च सति मन्त्रार्थवादगता ह्यविरुद्धाः अपूर्वाश्च अर्थाः सर्वे विधिशेषतयैव सिद्धा भवन्ति ।

**172.** To explain: In the text, 'One who knows Brahman attains the Highest (*Tai.* 1)' the attainment of Brahman is promised as the fruition, accruing to one who fulfils the injunction to meditate on Brahman. It means that one who is desirous of the Highest, must seek to know Brahman. Brahman is presented here as that which is to be attained. Its nature and characteristics are all described existentially, as supplementary to the action of meditation enjoined. Included in that body of existential knowledge, are the truths that Brahman is the creator of the world, the destroyer of it, the ground of the world, the inner soul of it and all the other truths both previously mentioned and unmentioned. Thus even as subsidiary to the imperative prescribing medita tion, all the existential propositions of the Vedānta, retain validity and significance. Therefore, the contents of texts, be they hymns or explanations, get established as subsidiary to injunctions provided they are special (apūrva) to them and are free from contradiction.

१७३. यथोक्तं द्रमिडभाष्ये — "'ऋणं हि वै जायते' इति श्रुतेः" इत्युपक्रम्य, "यद्यप्यवदानस्तुतिपरं वाक्यं, तथापि नासता स्तुतिरुपपद्यते" इति । एतदुक्तं भवति — सर्वो ह्यर्थवादभागः देवताराधनभूतयागादेः साङ्गस्य आराध्यदेवतायाश्च अदृष्टरूपान् गुणान् सहस्रशो वदन्, कर्मणि प्राशस्त्य बुद्धिमुत्पादयति; तेषामसद्भावे प्राशस्त्यबुद्धिरेव न स्यात् इति कर्मणि-

प्राशस्त्यबुद्धचर्थं गुणसद्भावमेव बोधयति इति । अनयैव दिशा सर्वमन्त्रार्थवादगता ह्यर्थाः सिद्धाः ।

**173.** The commentary of Dramiḍa concurs with this standpoint: Commencing with the reference to the śruti, 'The debt is born', it states, 'Though the sentence is a praise of sacrificial offering it cannot praise, if false'. The meaning of the comment is this: All the explanatory (*i.e.*, laudatory) portions of the Vedas praise the virtues of the sacrifices, with the full complement of their limbs, the sacrifices being acts of worship offered to gods. They also praise the virtues of the gods so worshipped. The virtues praised are such that they are not open to ordinary means of knowledge. The explanations praise the virtues of the sacrifices and gods a thousandfold. The purpose of such praise is to create the idea of the worthiness of the religious action prescribed. If the virtues extolled do not actually exist, the idea of the worthiness of the said action will not ensue. So the explanatory passages, if they have to succeed in creating the idea of the worthiness of the actions prescribed, must, of necessity, affirm and teach the reality of the virtues praised. On these lines the truth of all hymns and laudatory explanations gets proved.

१७४. अपि च कार्यवाक्यार्थवादिभिः "किमिदं कार्यत्वं नाम" इति वक्तव्यम् । "कृतिभावभाविता कृत्युद्देश्यता च" इति चेत्, किमिदं कृत्युद्देश्यत्वम्? "यदधिकृत्य कृतिः वर्तते तत् कृत्युद्देश्यत्वम्" इति चेत्, पुरुषव्यापाररूपायाः कृतेः कोऽयम् अधिकारो नाम? "यत्प्राप्तीच्छया कृतिमुत्पादयति पुरुषः, तत् कृत्युद्देश्यत्वम्' इति चेत्, हन्त! तर्हि इष्टत्वमेव कृत्युद्देश्यत्वम् ।

**174.** Now, those who hold that the meaning of words lies in what ought to be done must surely offer a definition of 'What ought to be done'. You may define that which is to be accomplished as 'What follows an act and is aimed at by it'. In that case we ask for the meaning of 'being

aimed at'. You may add, 'That for the sake of which the act is undertaken is the meaning of being aimed at by the action'. Then what is the meaning of 'being that for the sake of which an act is undertaken', the act being something a man does? You may further reply by saying, 'That is being aimed at by an act, for the sake of the attainment of which an agent performes an act'. Then on that clarification, 'to be aimed at by an act' means precisely 'to be desired'.

१७५. अथैवं मनुषे, 'इष्टस्यैव रूपद्वयमस्ति, इच्छाविषयतया स्थितिः, पुरुषप्रेरकत्वं च; तत्र प्रेरकत्वाकारः कृत्युद्देश्यत्वम्" इति । सोऽयं स्वपक्षाभिनिवेशकारितो वृथा श्रमः । तथा हि—इच्छाविषयतया प्रतीतस्य स्वप्रयत्नोत्पत्तिमन्तरेण असिद्धिरेव प्रेरकत्वं तत एव प्रवृत्तेः । इच्छायां जातायाम्, इष्टस्य स्वप्रयत्नोत्पत्तिमन्तरेण असिद्धिः प्रतीयते चेत्, ततः चिकीर्षा जायते, ततः प्रवर्तते पुरुषः इति तत्त्वविदां प्रक्रिया । तस्मात् इष्टस्य कृत्यधीनात्मलाभत्वातिरेकि कृत्युद्देश्यत्वं नाम किमपि न दृश्यते ।

**175.** You may develop your explanation this way: 'What is desired has two forms. In the first place, it is an object of desire. In the second place, it is what prompts effort on the part of the agent. This latter is the meaning of "being aimed at by an act".' Now we say, that this labour of explanation, proceeding, as it does from an undue attachment to your own theory, is indeed futile. Our argument is this: By this property of 'prompting effort' can be meant only 'the impossibility of what is conceived as an object of desire coming into existence, without the agent's effort to bring it about'. It is this consciousness (of the unattainability of an object of desire without one's own exertion) that starts all action. Those who know the truth on this matter describe the process as follows: After the origination of desire, if the agent understands that the object of desire cannot come into existence without his own volitional effort, he develops the

desire to act. Then the man acts. Therefore, there is no meaning in anything being aimed at by an act, other than this one of the absolute dependence of the emergence into existence of an object of desire on the effort of the agent.

१७६. अथोच्येत—इष्टताहेतुश्च पुरुषानुकूलता, तत्पुरुषानुकूलत्वं कृत्युद्देश्यत्वमिति; नैवं, पुरुषानुकूलं सुखम् इत्यनर्थान्तरम्; तथा पुरुषप्रतिकूलं दुःखपर्यायम्; अतः सुखव्यतिरिक्तस्य कस्यापि पुरुषानुकूलत्वं न सम्भवति। ननु च दुःखनिवृत्तेरपि सुखव्यतिरिक्तायाः पुरुषानुकूलता दृष्टा? नैतत्; आत्मानुकूलं सुखम्, आत्मप्रतिकूलं दुःखम् इति हि सुखदुःखयोः विवेकः; तत्र आत्मानुकूलं सुखम् इष्टं भवति, तत्प्रतिकूलं दुःखं च अनिष्टम्। अतः दुःखसंयोगस्य असह्यतया तन्निवृत्तिरपि इष्टा भवति; तत एव इष्टतासाम्यात् अनुकूलताभ्रमः।

**176.** A further attempt at the clarification of 'being aimed at by action' may be made. 'An object is desired because it is agreeable. To be agreeable is to be aimed at by action'. We dismiss the explanation. Pleasure is what is agreeable. Pain is what is disagreeable. Therefore nothing other than pleasure can be agreeable. You may object by saying that the removal of pain, which removal is different from pleasure, is also found to be agreeable. It is not so, we reply. That which is agreeable to the self is pleasure. That which is disagreeable is pain. This is the difference between pleasure and pain. Pleasure which is agreeable to the self, comes to be desired. Pain which is disagreeable to the self, comes to be disliked. Therefore, as the conjunction with pain is unendurable, its elimination also comes to be desired. Therefore, as there is similarity in being desired, the elimination of pain is also wrongly conceived as agreeable.

१७७. तथा हि—प्रकृतिसंसृष्टस्य संसारिणः पुरुषस्य अनुकूलसंयोगः, प्रतिकूलसंयोगः, स्वरूपेणावस्थितिः इति तिस्रः अवस्थाः; तत्र प्रतिकूलसम्बन्धनिवृत्तिः अनुकूलसंबन्धनिवृत्तिश्च स्वरूपेण अवस्थितिरेव। तस्मात् प्रतिकूल-

संयोगे वर्तमाने, तन्निवृत्तिरूपा स्वरूपेण अवस्थितिरपि इष्टा भवति, तत्र इष्टतासाम्यादनुकूलताभ्रमः । अतः सुखस्वरूपत्वादनुकूलतायाः नियोगस्य अनुकूलतां वदन्तं प्रामाणिकाः परिहसन्ति ।

**177.** To explain: Man, enmeshed in matter, experiences three states, that of conjunction with the agreeable, conjunction with the disagreeable and that of existence in his own natural condition. Therefore, the elimination of the conjunction with the agreeable and that of the conjunction with the disagreeable would be the self's natural state. Therefore, if there is conjunction with the disagreeable, the elimination of that conjunction, even though it is merely a natural state, becomes an object of desire. Since there is similarity by virtue of being an object of desire, this elimination of the conjunction with pain is wrongly taken to be agreeable. Therefore, as to be agreeable is to be a pleasure, honest thinkers consider the view that the obligation is agreeable in nature as ridiculous.

१७८. इष्टस्य अर्थविशेषस्य निर्वर्तकतयैव हि नियोगस्य नियोगत्वं स्थिरत्वम् अपूर्वत्वं च प्रतीयते । "स्वर्गकामो यजेत" इत्यत्र कार्यस्य क्रियातिरिक्तता स्वर्गकामपदसमभिव्याहारेण स्वर्गसाधनत्वनिश्चयादेव भवति । न च वाच्यं 'यजेत" इत्यत्र प्रथमं नियोगः स्वप्रधानतयैव प्रतीयते, स्वर्गकामपदसमभिव्याहारात् स्वसिद्धये स्वर्गसिद्ध्यनुकूलता च नियोगस्य इति । "यजेत" इति हि धात्वर्थस्य पुरुषप्रयत्नसाध्यता प्रतीयते; स्वर्गकामपदसमभिव्याहारादेव धात्वर्थातिरेकिणो नियोगत्वं स्थिरत्वम् अपूर्वत्वं च इत्यादि अवगम्यते । तच्च स्वर्गसाधनत्वप्रतीतिनिबन्धनम् । समभिव्याहृतस्वर्गकामपदार्थान्वययोग्यं स्वर्गसाधनमेव कार्यं लिङादयोऽभिदधति इति हि लोकव्युत्पत्तिरपि तिरस्कृता ।

**178.** Further, the obligation is considered an obligation and as abiding and transcendent precisely on the ground that it brings into being an object of desire. In the injunction, 'Let one, desirous of heaven, perform a sacrifice (*Ya. II, v,* 5)',

the import transcends the mere action, because it is determined to be the means of attaining heaven on account of the syntactically juxtaposed expression 'desirous of heaven'. It is not right to maintain, as is done by the opponent, that in the injunction 'Let him sacrifice', the element that gets first apprehended in an independent manner by the person to whom the injunction is addressed as the matter of intrinsic importance, is the element of obligation that he should sacrifice and that, afterwards, as a derivative thought, the idea of its being conducive to the attainment of heaven is brought in for purposes of causing the fulfilment of the obligation, as the words referring to the desire for heaven are juxtaposed. This account of the injunctive proposition is not right; as a matter of fact, when the agent hears the verb 'sacrifice' the action that is the meaning of the verb-root presents itself as one that a person can perform. On account of the juxtaposition of the phrase referring to desire for heaven, something over and above just that meaning of the verb-root, as constituting an obligation, permanent and transcendent, presents itself to the mind of the person to whom the injunction is addressed. All that apprehension of the obligatoriness of the action proposed and so on, follows definitely from the idea that its observance is the means to the attainment of heaven. The common understanding that the potential form of the verb etc. enjoin an obligation whose fulfilment is a means to the attainment of heaven, and which obligation in its inherent nature is interwoven with the words 'desirous of heaven' in meaning is simply rejected without any basis by the opponent's explanation.

१७६. एतदुक्तं भवति — समभिव्याहृतपदान्तरवाच्यान्वययोग्यमेव इतरपदप्रतिपाद्यम् इति अन्विताभिधायिपदसङ्घातरूपवाक्यश्रवणसमन्तरमेव प्रतीयते । तच्च स्वर्गसाधनरूपम्; अतः क्रियावत् अनन्यार्थतापि विरोधादेव परित्यक्ता इति । अत एव "गङ्गायां घोषः" इत्यादौ घोषप्रतिवासयोग्या-

र्थोपस्थापनपरत्वं गङ्गापदस्य आश्रीयते । प्रथमं गङ्गापदेन गङ्गार्थः स्मृत इति, गङ्गापदार्थस्य पेयत्वं न वाक्यार्थान्वयी भवति । एवमत्रापि "यजेत" इत्येतावन्मात्रश्रवणे कार्यमनन्यार्थं स्मृतमिति वाक्यार्थान्वयसमये कार्यस्य अनन्यार्थता नावतिष्ठते ।

**179.** To explain: Each word presents its meaning as fit to be connected with the meanings of the other words of the sentence in which it is used. This gets understood immediately after hearing the sentence which is a combination of words whose meanings form one inter-related system of meanings. Now, in the present case, this fitness of the meaning of the verb 'sacrifice' to enter into relationship with the meanings of other words lies in the sacrifice being instrumental to the attainment of heaven. Therefore, just as mere action is superseded and we have an obligation instead, the independence and intrinsic nature of the meaning of the verb 'sacrifice' must also be abandoned in view of the contradiction resulting otherwise. This is the reason why, in the expression 'Village on the Gaṅgā', the term Gaṅgā must be so understood as to mean something on which there can be a village. Just because, to start with, the term 'Gaṅgā', means the river Gaṅgā, the meaning of the term 'Gaṅgā', in the expression 'Village on the Gaṅgā' cannot be water, if the meaning of the term is to be fitted into the sense of the whole expression. Even so, here, in the sentence 'Let one, desirous of heaven, sacrifice' even if the verb 'sacrifice' recalls mere obligation or something to be done as soon as heard as an independent non-instrumental element, when the total and integrated import of the proposition is apprehended, the obligation cannot remain an unrelated and non-instrumental element.

१८०. कार्याभिधायिपदश्रवणवेलायां प्रथमं कार्यम् अनन्यार्थं प्रतीतम् इत्येतदपि न सङ्गच्छते, व्युत्पत्तिकाले गवानयनादिक्रियायाः दुःखरूपायाः इष्ट-

विशेषसाधनतयैव कार्यताप्रतीतेः । अतः नियोगस्य पुरुषानुकूलत्वं सर्वलोकविरुद्धम्; नियोगस्य सुखरूपपुरुषानुकूलतां वदतः स्वानुभवविरोधश्च । "कारिर्या वृष्टिकामो यजेत" इत्यादिषु सिद्धेऽपि नियोगे वृष्ट्यादिसिद्धिनिमित्तस्य वृष्टिव्यतिरेकेण नियोगस्य अनुकूलता नानुभूयते । यद्यपि अस्मिन् जन्मनि वृष्ट्यादिसिद्धेरनियमः; तथापि अनियमादेव नियोगसिद्धिः अवश्याश्रयणीया । तस्मिन् अनुकूलतापर्यायसुखानुभूतिः न विद्यते । एवम् उक्तरीत्या कृतिसाध्येष्टत्वातिरेकि कृत्युद्देश्यत्वं न दृश्यते ।

**180.** It is also not true—what has been admitted for the sake of argument—that on hearing a term that signifies something to be done, we apprehend that something as an independent and non-instrumental obligation. At the time of understanding an obligation, actions like bringing a cow, being troublesome, cannot acquire the character of obligatoriness to the conciousness of the subject, unless the action is presented as a means to an object of desire. Thus the dictum, 'An obligation is that which is agreeable' violates universal understanding. The person who holds that an obligation is agreeable to the person to whom it is addressed is going against his own personal experience as well. In the case of the injunction, 'One, desirous of rain, should sacrifice with kārīrī', that obligation, instrumental to causing rain, can on no account be experienced as agreeable in itself apart from its declared relationship to rain. Even if in this life, the causation of rain is uncertain, that very uncertainty constitutes it an obligation (of a transcendent character). In that latter case, there is clearly no experience of the agreeable, the same as pleasure. Thus the meaning of 'being aimed at' cannot be seen to be anything different from the attainability through effort and the fact of being desired.

१८१. कृतिं प्रति शेषित्वं कृत्युद्देश्यत्वमिति चेत्, किमिदं शेषित्वं किं च शेषत्वम् इति वक्तव्यम्; कार्यं प्रति सम्बन्धी शेषः, तत्प्रतिसम्बन्धित्वं

शेषित्वमिति चेत्, एवं तर्हि, कार्यत्वमेव शेषित्वमित्युक्तं भवति; कार्यत्वमेव हि विचार्यते; परोद्देशप्रवृत्तकृतिव्याप्त्यर्हत्वं शेषत्वमिति चेत्, कोऽयं परोद्देशो नामेति अयमेव हि विचार्यते । उद्देश्यत्वं नाम ईप्सितसाध्यत्वमिति चेत्, किमीप्सितत्वम्? कृतिप्रयोजनत्वमिति चेत्, पुरुषस्य कृत्यारम्भप्रयोजनमेव हि कृतिप्रयोजनम्; स च इच्छाविषयः कृत्यधीनात्मलाभ इति पूर्वोक्त एव ।

**181.** A new definition of 'being aimed at by the act' may be offered as that 'to which other things are subsidiary'. If that be the definition, these two expressions 'being that to which others are subsidiary' and 'that which is subsidiary to another' need definition. If you define 'the subsidiary' as that which is the correlative of what is to be done and the principal element as that which is the correlative of the subsidiary, from these definitions, it is evident that you define the principal element as 'that which is to be done'. But it is precisely this factor described as 'what is to be done' whose definition is sought. The subsidiary may be sought to be defined in another way: 'That which is invariably subsumed under an effort aiming at a purpose beyond itself is the subsidiary'. But the question as to what this 'aiming at a pupose beyond itself' is, comes up for consideration. It is in fact this idea of being aimed at as a purpose that is necessitating all this discussion. 'To be aimed at as a purpose is to be desired and to be possible.' That may be your definition. What is the meaning of being 'desired'? 'To be desired', you may reply, 'is to be the purpose of effort'. Now the purpose of effort is the purpose for realizing which an agent puts forth effort. We have already determined the nature of this purpose, as meaning an object of desire, depending on the effort of the agent to come into being.

१८२. अयमेव हि सर्वत्र शेषशेषिभावः—परगतातिशयाधानेच्छया उपादेयत्वमेव यस्य स्वरूपं स शेषः, परः शेषी; फलोत्पत्तीच्छया यागादेः तत्प्रयत्नस्य च उपादेयत्वं, यागादिसिद्धीच्छया अन्यत् सर्वमुपादेयम् । एवं

गर्भदासादीनामपि पुरुषविशेषातिशयाधानेच्छया उपादेयत्वमेव स्वरूपम्; एवम् ईश्वरगतातिशयाधानेच्छया उपादेयत्वमेव चेतनाचेतनात्मकस्य नित्यस्य अनित्यस्य च सर्वस्य वस्तुनः स्वरूपमिति, सर्वम् ईश्वरशेषभूतं, सर्वस्य च ईश्वरः शेषीति; "सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः", "पतिं विश्वस्य" इत्याद्युक्तम् । "कृतिसाध्यं प्रधानं यत् तत्कार्यमभिधीयते" इत्ययमर्थः श्रद्दधानेष्वेव शोभते ।

**182.** The real and universal definition of śeṣa and śeṣin (the subsidiary and the principal) must be enunciated as follows: That whose nature lies solely in being valued through a desire to contribute a special excellence to another entity is the śeṣa. The other is the śeṣin (*i.e.*, that to which the subsidiary contributes special excellence). Out of a desire to produce the fruit of sacrifice, both the sacrifice and the volitional exertion for the sake of sacrifice, come to be undertaken. The accessories of sacrifice, come to be attended to, out of the desire to accomplish the sacrifice. Similarly, in the case of servants their nature lies only in being valued on account of the desire to contribute something special to the master. Similarly all entities, sentient and non-sentient, eternal and non-eternal, have as thier sole nature, the character of being valued through a desire to make some special contribution to the Supreme. Hence all entities are described as subsidiary to him. He is the principal entity, the Lord of all, the śeṣin. The śrutis say, 'He is the controller of all, the Lord of all (*Bṛ. VI, iv,* 22)', 'The master of the universe (*Mahā.*)' etc. Therefore the definition, 'That which is attainable through effort and is the principal is the meaning of "what is to be accomplished" ' is one that can charm only the credulous followers.

१८३. अपि च "स्वर्गकामो यजेत" इत्यादिषु लकारवाच्यकर्तृविशेषसमर्पणपराणां स्वर्गकामादिपदानां नियोज्यविशेषसमर्पणपरत्वं शब्दानुशासन-

विरुद्धं केन अवगम्यते? साध्यस्वर्गविशिष्टस्य *अस्वर्गसाधने कर्तृत्वान्वयो न घटते इति चेत्, नियोज्यत्वान्वयोऽपि न घटत इति हि स्वर्गसाधनत्व-निश्चयः, स तु शास्त्रसिद्धे कर्तृत्वान्वये स्वर्गसाधनत्वनिश्चयः क्रियते । यथा "भोक्तुकामो देवदत्तगृहं गच्छेत्" इत्युक्ते, भोजनकामस्य देवदत्तगृहगमने कर्तृत्वश्रवणादेव प्रागज्ञातमपि भोजनसाधनत्वं देवदत्तगृहगमनस्य अवगम्यते; एवमत्रापि भवति ।

**183.** Moreover, what ground is there for taking words like 'desirous of heaven' in a sentence like 'He, who is desirous of heaven, should sacrifice' as qualifying the subject of the injunction and not the agent of the sacrifice? In the injunction, the mood etc. of the verb indicate the agent of the action proposed (who must be specifically characterised by some term), and the clause. 'He, who is desirous of heaven' supplies the required qualification of the agent. Taking it as a qualification of the subject of injunction and not of the agent of action is in contradiction to the principles of the science of language. You may argue, 'The person with whom heaven is the end, cannot be made the agent of an action, not instrumental to the securing of heaven'. We answer, 'He cannot also be, for the same reason, made the subject of the injunction'. Therefore it is to be construed decisively that the sacrifice is a means to the securing of heaven. The scripture connects him with the sacrifice as the agent, and therefore, we understand that the prescribed action must be the means for the desired end of securing heaven. When it is said, "One desirous of a meal, must go to Devadatta's house", the man desirous of a meal is brought into connection with the action of going to Devadatta's house as the agent of

---

* Though most of the printed editions have the reading 'स्वर्ग-साधने' we have adopted the reading 'अस्वर्गसाधने' based upon the commentary of Sudarśanasūri which reads as follows— 'स्वर्गकामस्य अस्वर्गसाधने कर्तृत्वान्वयो न घटते इति' ।

that action, and therefore, we understand, even if it was not understood before, that going to Ḍevadatta's house is the means of securing a meal. Such is the case in the present instance also.

१८४. न हि क्रियान्तरं प्रति कर्तृतया श्रुतस्य क्रियान्तरे कर्तृत्वकल्पनं युक्तम्; "यजेत" इति हि यागकर्तृतया श्रुतस्य बुद्धौ कर्तृत्वकल्पनं क्रियते; बुद्धेः कर्तृत्वकल्पनमेव हि नियोज्यत्वम्। यथोक्तम्—"नियोज्यः स च कार्यं यः स्वकीयत्वेन बुद्ध्यते" इति। यष्टृत्वानुगुणं तद्बोद्धृत्वम् इति चेत्, देवदत्तः पचेत् इति पाककर्तृतया श्रुतस्य देवदत्तस्य, पाकार्थगमनं पाकानुगुणमिति, गमने कर्तृत्वकल्पनं न युज्यते।

**184.** Further, one who is associated in the injunction with one action, as its agent, should not be, in interpretation, associated with another action as the agent of the latter. You are taking the man, spoken of in the sentence as the agent of sacrifice, and making him the agent of the mental act of accepting the injunction imposed. You can only understand the subject of injunction as the agent to whom the mental act of accepting an injunction is presented as the act he has to perform. It has been so explained: 'He is the subject of an injunction, who cognizes an imperative as pertaining to himself'. If you say that being an agent of cognition is conducive to being an agent of sacrifice, we urge the following application of your procedure. If the injunction 'Let Devadatta cook' is heard, Devadatta is associated in the sentence with cooking as its agent. If Devadatta goes somewhere for purposes of cooking, that going is conducive to his cooking. Therefore, the sentence enjoins upon Devadatta the action of going. The unreasonableness of such construction is evident.

१८५. किञ्च लिङादिशब्दवाच्यं स्थायिरूपं किमिति अपूर्वमाश्रीयते? स्वर्गकामपदसमभिव्याहारानुपपत्तेः इति चेत्, का अत्रानुपपत्तिः? सिषाधयि-

षितस्वर्गो हि स्वर्गकामः, तस्य स्वर्गकामस्य कालान्तरभाविस्वर्गसिद्धौ क्षणभङ्गिनी यागादिक्रिया न समर्था इति चेत्, अनाघ्रातवेदसिद्धान्तानाम् इयमनुपपत्तिः, सर्वैः कर्मभिः आराधितः परमेश्वरः भगवान् नारायणः तत्तदिष्टं फलं ददाति इति वेदविदो वदन्ति ।

**185.** Further, what makes you resort to an unseen potency (apūrva), an abiding entity, supposed to be designated by the potential mood of the verbs in the injunctive propositions? If it be said, 'Otherwise the juxtaposed phrase "desirous of heaven" would lose all meaning', we ask, 'What is the difficulty that makes it lose all meaning?'

**(Objection):** The man desirous of heaven is a person, the attainment of heaven by whom is the end desired. This attainment is an event that has to take place in future, at a point of time other than the present point of time. Action of the form of sacrifice etc. is an instantaneously perishing phenomenon. Such a perishing event of the present cannot bring about the attainment of heaven at a future point of time.

**(Reply):** If this be said, we answer, this is an impossibility that could strike only those who have not had even the faintest idea of the philosophy of the Vedas. Those who understand the Vedas maintain that the supreme Lord, Bhagavān Nārāyana, being worshipped through the various religious performances, rewards the worshippers with the objects they desire.

१८६. यथाहुः वेदविदग्रेसराः द्रमिडाचार्याः "फलसम्बिभत्सया कर्मभिरात्मानं पिप्रीषन्ति, स प्रीतोऽलं फलाय इति शास्त्रमर्यादा" इति । फलसंबन्धेच्छया कर्मभिः यागदानहोमादिभिः इन्द्रादिदेवतामुखेन तत्तदन्तर्यामिरूपेण अवस्थितम् इन्द्रादिशब्दवाच्यं परमात्मानं भगवन्तं वासुदेवम् आरिराधयिषन्ति; स हि कर्मभिराराधितः तेषाम् इष्टानि फलानि प्रयच्छति इत्यर्थः ।

**186.** So says the teacher, Dramiḍa, foremost among the knowers of the Veda: 'Desirous of fruits, they seek to please (the supreme) Ātman. He being pleased, confers the fruits. This is the order of things proclaimed in the scriptures'. He means the following: Out of a desire for the attainment of fruits, men seek to worship, through actions like yāga, dāna and homa, the supreme Self, Bhagavān Vāsudeva, through the deities like Indra, in whom he dwells as the inner ruler and therefore bears all the designations like Indra. He being so worshipped gives them the fruits they desire.

१८७. तथा च श्रुतिः "इष्टापूर्तं बहुधा जातं जायमानं विश्वं बिभर्ति भुवनस्य नाभिः" इति; "इष्टापूर्तम्" इति सकलश्रुतिस्मृतिचोदितं कर्म उच्यते; तत् "विश्वं बिभर्ति" इन्द्राग्निवरुणादिसर्वदेवतासम्बन्धितया प्रतीयमानं, तत्तदन्तरात्मतया अवस्थितः परमपुरुषः स्वयमेव "बिभर्ति", स्वयमेव स्वीकरोति; "भुवनस्य नाभिः" ब्रह्मक्षत्रादिसर्ववर्णपूर्णस्य भुवनस्य धारकः, तैस्तैः कर्मभिराराधितः तत्तदिष्टफलप्रदानेन भुवनानां धारक इति, "नाभिः" इत्युक्तः । अग्निवायुप्रभृतिदेवतान्तरात्मतया तत्तच्छब्दाभिधेयः अयमेवेत्याह "तदेवाग्निस्तद्वायुस्तत्सूर्यस्तदु चन्द्रमाः" इति ।

**187.** So does the śruti also declare: 'The hub of the universe bears all iṣṭā and pūrta, done before and being done now (*Mahā*).' By 'iṣṭā and pūrta' are meant actions enjoined by the Vedas and smṛtis. 'He bears all that' means that the supreme Self accepts all performances, enjoined by the Vedas and smṛtis, ordinarily thought of as associated with the deities like Indra and Agni, as he dwells in all deities as their inner soul. He is called the 'hub of the universe' as he is the supporter of the world full of all kinds of beings like brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas, by sustaining them through granting the various objects of their desire, when worshipped by them through their varied acts of worship. The śruti also says that the supreme Self himself is named by the designations of all deities because he is the inner soul of all

deities like Agni and Vāyu. 'That is Agni, that is Vāyu, that is Sūrya and that is Chandramas (*Mahā*)'.

१८८. यथोक्तं भगवता —

योयो यां यां तनुं भक्तः श्रद्धयार्चितुमिच्छति ।
तस्य तस्याचलां श्रद्धां तामेव विदधाम्यहम् ॥
स तया श्रद्धया युक्तः तस्याराधनमीहते ।
लभते च ततः कामान् मयैव विहितान् हि तान् ॥

"यां यां तनुम्" इन्द्रादिदेवताविशेषाः, तत्तदन्तर्यामितया अवस्थितस्य भगवतः तनवः शरीराणि इत्यर्थः । "अहं हि सर्वयज्ञानां भोक्ता च प्रभुरेव च" इत्यादि; "प्रभुरेव च" इति सर्वफलानां प्रदाता चेत्यर्थः । तथा च —

यज्ञैस्त्वमिज्यसे नित्यं सर्वदेवमयाच्युत ।
यैस्स्वधर्मपरैर्नाथ नरैराराधितो भवान् ।
ते तरन्त्यखिलामेतां मायामात्मविमुक्तये ॥ इति ।

**188.** The Lord also says, 'Whatever form any devotee may desire to worship with earnest faith, I will myself bring about in him immovable faith towards that deity of his choice. He, possessed of that faith, worship that deity and from that deity receives boons which, I myself, give unto him (*Gītā, VII*, 21-22)'. 'Whatever form (tanu)' means the various deities, who are in reality his bodies, as the Lord dwells in them as their inner controller. 'I am indeed the one who enjoys all sacrifices and I am also their master (*Gītā, IX*, 24);' being 'their master' means that he is the giver of all fruits. Again the scripture says: 'Acyuta, Thou art the embodiment of all gods and art worshipped always through sacrifices (*Vi. V, xx*, 97);' 'Thou art, O Lord, worshipped by those who are devoted to their dharma; they cross this māyā wholly and attain release of soul (*Vi. V, xxx*, 16)'.

१८९. सेतिहासपुराणेषु सर्वेष्वेव वेदेषु सर्वाणि कर्माणि सर्वेश्वराराधनरूपाणि, तैस्तैः कर्मभिराराधितः पुरुषोत्तमः तत्तदिष्टफलं ददाति इति तत्र तत्र प्रपञ्चितम् ।

**189.** Thus in all the Vedas along with the itihāsas and purāṇas, we learn that all religious acts are of the nature of the worship of the supreme Lord. He, the supreme Person so worshipped through them, grants all the desired fruits. This truth is everywhere explained.

१९०. एवमेव हि सर्वज्ञं, सर्वशक्तिं, सर्वेश्वरं भगवन्तम् इन्द्रादिदेवतान्तर्यामिरूपेण यागदानहोमादिवेदोदितसर्वकर्मणां भोक्तारं सर्वफलानां प्रदातारं, च सर्वाः श्रुतयो वदन्ति, "चतुर्होतारो यत्र सम्पदं गच्छन्ति देवैः" इत्याद्याः; "चतुर्होतारः" यज्ञाः, "यत्र" परमात्मनि देवेष्वन्तर्यामितया अवस्थिते "देवैः" सम्बन्धं गच्छन्ति इत्यर्थः । अन्तर्यामिरूपेण अवस्थितस्य परमात्मनः शरीरतया अवस्थितानामिन्द्रादीनां यागादिसम्बन्धः इत्युक्तं भवति । यथोक्तं भगवता — "भोक्तारं यज्ञतपसां सर्वलोकमहेश्वरम्" इति । तस्मात् अग्न्यादिदेवतान्तर्यामिभूतपरमपुरुषाराधनभूतानि सर्वाणि कर्माणि, स एव च अभिलषितप्रदायी इति किमत्र अपूर्वेण व्युत्पत्तिपथदूरवर्तिना वाच्यतया अभ्युपगतेन कल्पितेन वा प्रयोजनम् ।

**190.** All the śrutis declare that the omniscient, omnipotent, supreme Lord, Bhagavān accepts and enjoys all sacred acts like sacrifice, charity and oblation in fire prescribed in the Vedas, being the inner controller of all deities like Indra and confers on the worshippers all the fruits of those acts; for instance, 'Where the *catur-hotṛs* get connected to the deities (*Ā. III*, 21)'. *Catur-hotṛs* means sacrifices. 'Where' means in Paramātman, who abides in the deities as the inner ruler; the sacrifices get connected to the deities in him. In other words, the deities like Indra etc. are brought into relationship with sacrifices, by the fact that they are the bodies of the supreme Self who dwells in them as the inner

ruler. The Lord also says, 'Know me as the recipient of all sacrifices and penances and the great Lord of the worlds (*Gītā*, *V*, 29)'. Therefore, all religious acts are of the nature of worship offered to the supreme Person indwelling in all deities like Indra as their inner ruler. It is he that grants all objects of all desire. Such being the case, what utility is there in positing an unseen power (apūrva), which is far removed from the signification of terms as the direct meaning of terms or as a postulate to account for the fruition of karma?

१९१. एवं च सति लिङादेः कोऽयमर्थः परिगृहीतो भवति? यज-देवपूजायाम् इति देवताराधनभूतयागादेः प्रकृत्यर्थस्य कर्तृव्यापारसाध्यतां व्युत्पत्तिसिद्धां लिङादयः अभिदधति इति न किञ्चिदनुपपन्नम्। कर्तृवाचिनां प्रत्ययानां प्रकृत्यर्थस्य कर्तृव्यापारसंबन्धप्रकारो हि वाच्यः। भूतवर्तमान-तादिम् अन्ये वदन्ति; लिङादयस्तु कर्तृव्यापारसाध्यतां वदन्ति।

**191.** In that case, what meaning is to be attached to the imperative mood of verbs (like 'sacrifice' as in the injunction, 'Let him sacrifice')? The root of the verb, 'yaj' means the worship of gods. The imperative mood etc. signify that the act signified by the verb-root is such that it can be performed by the agent. There is clearly no difficulty. The affixes, referring to the agent, point out the specific ways in which the action referred to by the verb-root, is related to the activity of the agent. The other affixes tell the tense etc. The imperative mood etc., point out that act is something that can be accomplished by the agent.

१९२. अपि च कामिनः कर्तव्यतया कर्म विधाय, कर्मणो देवताराधन-रूपतां तद्द्वारेण फलसिद्धिं च तत्तत्कर्मविधिवाक्यान्येव वदन्ति—"वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकामः वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता वायुमेव स्वेन भागधेयेनोप-धावति स एवैनं भूतिं गमयति" इत्यादीनि; नात्र फलसिद्ध्यनुपपत्तिः कापि

दृश्यते इति, फलसाधनत्वावगतिः औपादानिकी इत्यपि न सङ्गच्छते; विध्यपेक्षितं यागादेः फलसाधनत्वप्रकारं वाक्यशेष एव बोधयति इत्यर्थः ।

**192.** Further, the injunctive propositions enjoin a certain course of action upon the person desirous of a certain result and the same propositions affirm that the course of action enjoined is worship to be offered to deities, and the deities bring about the realization of the desired end. For example, we have this text, 'Let him, who is desirous of prosperity, offer a white animal to Vāyu; for Vāyu is the swiftest god. The man thus approaches Vāyu with his proper share and Vāyu leads him to prosperity (*Tai. Saṁhitā, II, i,* 1)'. In this instant we see nothing rendering the realization of the end impossible. Therefore it is unreasonable to suppose that the idea of the action enjoined being the means to the realization of the end is a later construction of thought built up for completing the injunction. The idea that the sacrifices etc. are the means for the attainment of ends is taught by the proposition itself and there is no need for any subsequent construction for completing the injunctive proposition.

१९३. "तस्मात् ब्राह्मणाय नापगुरेत" इत्यत्र अपगोरणनिषेधविधिपरवाक्यशेषे श्रूयमाणं निषेध्यस्य अपगोरणस्य शतयातनासाधनत्वं निषेधविध्युपयोगि इति हि स्वीक्रियते । अत्र पुनः कामिनः कर्तव्यतया विहितस्य यागादेः काम्यस्वर्गादिसाधनत्वप्रकारं वाक्यशेषावगतम् अनादृत्य किमिति उपादानेन यागादेः फलसाधनत्वं परिकल्प्यते । हिरण्यनिधिमपवरके निधाय याचते कोद्रवादिलुब्धः कृपणं जनम् इति श्रूयते, तदेतत् युष्मासु दृश्यते ।

**193.** In the prohibitory injunction, 'Therefore a brāhmaṇa should not be threatened (*Mī. III, iv,* 17)', the rest of the sentence itself makes know that the prohibited act of threatening a brāhmaṇa leads to the fine of a hundred pieces of gold, and since this idea of the means-end relation between threatening a brāhmaṇa and the fine is contributory to the

prohibitory injunction, it is accepted. In the other case of a man desirous of heaven being enjoined to perform a sacrifice, why should you resort to the supposition of a subsequent construction of the idea of sacrifice being the means of the attainment of heaven, with a view to completing the proposition when in fact the rest of the proposition itself explicitly lays down that the sacrifice leads to heaven? Why do you disregard the explicitly stated content of the proposition and posit a supplementing construction of the idea of this means-end relationship? It is said that a person placed his treasure of gold in the inner apartment of his house and went about begging of the poor and miserable for a handful of grains. Exactly similar is your attitude.

१९४. शतयातनासाधनत्वमपि न अदृष्टद्वारेण; चोदितान्यनुतिष्ठत: विहितं कर्माकुर्वत: निन्दितानि च कुर्वत: सर्वाणि सुखानि दु:खानि च परमपुरुषानुग्रहनिग्रहाभ्यामेव भवति । "एष ह्येवानन्दयाति", "अथ सोऽभयंगतो भवति", "अथ तस्य भयं भवति", "भीषास्माद्वात: पवते भीषोदेति सूर्य: भीषास्मादग्निश्चेन्द्रश्च मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चम इति", "एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठत:", "एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि ददतो मनुष्या प्रशंसन्ति यजमानं देवा: दर्वीं पितरोऽन्वायत्ता:" इत्याद्यनेकविधा: श्रुतय: सन्ति ।

**194.** The causation of the penalty of a hundred pieces of gold is also not through any unseen power. Persons who perform actions enjoined in the scriptures, those who fail to perform such, and those who indulge in prohibited actions, all these come to have happiness or misery as the case may be, through the favour or disfavour of the Supreme. The scriptures voice forth this principle: 'It is he that causes joy (*Tai. II*, 7);' 'Then he attains fearlessness (*Tai. II*, 7);' 'Then there is fear for him (*Tai. II*, 7);' 'Through fear of him the wind blows, through fear of him the sun rises, through fear

of him Agni and Indra obey and Mṛtyu, the fifth, speeds along (*Tai. II*, 8);' 'By the command of this imperishable One, O Gārgi, the sun and the moon stand sustained (*Bṛ. III*, *viii*, 9);' 'By the command of this imperishable One, O Gārgi, men (dependent on gifts) praise those that give, the gods, (dependent on sacrifice), praise the sacrificer, and the manes, dependent on darvīhoma, praise it (*Bṛ. III*, *VIII*, 9)'.

१९५. यथोक्तं द्रमिडभाष्ये—"तस्य आज्ञया धावति वायुः, नद्यः स्रवन्ति, तेन च कृतसीमानो जलाशयाः समदा इव मेषविसर्पितं कुर्वन्ति" इति, "तत्सङ्कल्पनिबन्धना हि इमे लोकाः न च्यवन्ते, न स्फुटन्ते; स्वशासनानुवर्तिनं ज्ञात्वा कारुण्यात् स भगवान् वर्धयेत विद्वान् कर्मदक्षः" इति च ।

**195.** *The Dramiḍa-bhāṣya* also says, 'By his orders, the wind blows, the rivers flow and the seas, bounded by him, swell and rise. as if intoxicated'. (Further, the *bhāṣya* continues), 'These worlds, governed by his will, stand without falling and without bursting up. The Bhagavān, seeing one who abides by his commands, promotes out of compassion his progress seeing that he is a man of knowledge and capable in action.'

१९६. परमपुरुषयाथात्म्यज्ञानपूर्वकं तदुपासनादिविहितकर्मानुष्ठायिनः तत्प्रसादात् तत्प्राप्तिपर्यन्तानि सुखानि अभयं च यथाधिकारं भवन्ति । तज्ज्ञानपूर्वकं तदुपासनादि विहितं कर्माकुर्वतः निन्दितानि च कुर्वतः तन्निग्रहादेव तदप्राप्तिपूर्वकापरिमितदुःखानि भयं च भवन्ति ।

**196.** The seekers who, after acquiring an understanding of the real nature of the supreme Person, devote themselves to the performance of the correct modes of action like the meditation on him, will attain through his grace all joys upto the very attainment of him and perfect freedom from fear. Those, who, on the other hand, do not acquire that knowledge and do not devote themselves to the performance of the correct modes of action, like the meditation on him,

and in fact, indulge in actions prohibited, will, through his disfavour, have as their lot measureless sorrow and fear, resulting from the non-attainment of him.

१९७. यथोक्तं भगवता—"नियतं कुरु कर्म त्वं कर्म ज्यायो ह्यकर्मणः" इत्यादिना कृत्स्नं कर्म ज्ञानपूर्वकमनुष्ठेयं विधाय, "मयि सर्वाणि कर्माणि संन्यस्य" इति सर्वस्य कर्मणः स्वाराधनताम्, आत्मनां स्वनियाम्यतां च प्रतिपाद्य,

ये मे मतमिदं नित्यमनुतिष्ठन्ति मानवाः ।
श्रद्धावन्तोऽनसूयन्तो मुच्यन्ते तेऽपि कर्मभिः ॥
ये त्वेतदभ्यसूयन्तो नानुतिष्ठन्ति मे मतम् ।
सर्वज्ञानविमूढांस्तान् विद्धि नष्टानचेतसः ॥

इति स्वाज्ञानुवर्तिनः प्रशस्य, विपरीतान् विनिन्द्य, पुनरपि स्वाज्ञानुपालनम् अकुर्वताम् आसुरप्रकृत्यन्तर्भावम् अभिधाय, अधमा गतिश्च उक्ता;

तानहं द्विषतः क्रूरान् संसारेषु नराधमान् ।
क्षिपाम्यजस्रमशुभान् आसुरीष्वेव योनिषु ॥
आसुरीं योनिमापन्ना मूढा जन्मनि जन्मनि ।
मामप्राप्यैव कौन्तेय ततो यान्त्यधमां गतिम् ॥ इति ।
सर्वकर्माण्यपि सदा कुर्वाणो मद्व्यपाश्रयः ।
मत्प्रसादादवाप्नोति शाश्वतं पदमव्ययम् ॥

इति च स्वाज्ञानुवर्तिनां शाश्वतं पदं च उक्तम् । अश्रुतवेदान्तानां कर्मणि अश्रद्धा मा भूत इति देवताधिकरणेऽतिवादाः कृताः कर्ममात्रे यथा श्रद्धा स्यात् इति, सर्वं एकशास्त्रमिति वेदवित्सिद्धान्तः ।

**197.** The Lord says, 'Perform the action that is ordained. Action is superior to non-action (*Gītā, III*, 8)'. Commencing in this manner he enjoins all actions, preceded by knowledge, as worthy of performance and then goes on to say, 'Surrendering all actions unto me (*Gītā, III*, 30)' explaining thereby how all these actions are constitutive of the worship of him and how all the individual selves are subject to his control. He then commends those who conform to his commands and

reproves the contrary as follows: 'Those, who always follow this view of mine in their life, with earnest faith and without envy are released from karma. But, O Arjuna, those who are envious and do not follow this teaching of mine, know them to be devoid of all knowledge, senseless and lost (*Gītā*, *III*, 31-32)'. Then, again, he proceeds to point out that the persons, who do not abide by his commands, are included in the category of the demoniac in nature, and are heirs to a low destiny: 'I cast, again and again, those worst of men, who hate me and who are hard- hearted and who are unholy, into demoniac births. Having taken demoniac births and being deluded in birth after birth, they fail to attain me and sink into great degradation (*Gītā*, *XVI*, 19-20)'. He says that those who follow his commands are heirs to ever-lasting life: 'Even though constantly performing all actions, he who has come under my shelter, will attain through my grace, the good, ever-lasting and entire (*Gītā*, *XVIII*, 56)'. In the section discussing deities, exaggerated accounts of the self-sufficing efficacy of sacred works are given, to ward off the attitude of lack of faith concerning works in the minds of people, who have not yet learnt the Vedānta, the purpose being that they may have earnest faith at least in sacred works as such. But the true theory of those who know the Vedas is that the two systems, (karma-mīmāṁsā and brahma-mīmāṁsā) form a single body of knowledge.

१९८. तस्यैतस्य परस्य ब्रह्मणो नारायणस्य अपरिच्छेद्यज्ञानानन्दामलत्वस्वरूपवत्, ज्ञानशक्तिबलैश्वर्यवीर्यतेजःप्रभृत्यनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणवत्, स्वसङ्कल्पप्रवर्त्यस्वेतरसमस्तचिदचिद्वस्तुजातवत्, स्वाभिमतस्वानुरूपैकरूपदिव्यरूप- तदुचितनिरतिशयकल्याणविविधानन्तभूषण-स्वशक्तिसदृशापरिमितानन्ताश्चर्यनानाविधायुध -स्वाभिमतस्वानुरूपस्वरूपरूपगुणविभवैश्वर्यशीलाद्यनवधिकमहिममहिषी-स्वानुरूपकल्याणज्ञानक्रियाद्यपरिमेयगुणानन्तपरिजनपरिच्छद-स्वोचितनिखिलभोग्यभोगोपकरणाद्यनन्तमहाविभवावाङ्मनसगो -

चर-स्वरूपस्वभावदिव्यस्थानादि-नित्यतानिरवद्यतागोचरश्च सहस्रशः श्रुतयः सन्ति —

**198.** The texts of the Vedas define the substantive nature of this Nārāyaṇa, the supreme Brahman, as infinite knowledge, infinite bliss and infinite purity. They also sing of his unsurpassed, perfect and countless holy attributes like knowledge, power, sovereignty, strength, vigour and radiance. They describe him as one by whose will all other entities, both sentient and non-sentient, are sustained in their very being and controlled in all their activities. Similarly there are thousands of śrutis which describe him as follows: His divine form is wholly agreeable and appropriate to him; many kinds of numberless and infinitely auspicious ornament adorn him, suiting him eminently; he bears numberless, wondrous weapons, suited to his prowess; his divine consort is agreeable and suited to him in her essential nature, form, beauty, glory, sovereignty, compassion and unsurpassed greatness; he is served by (divine) accessories of service and numberless (divine) servants, who are suited to him and are endowed with holy knowledge and power of action and countless other virtues; his boundless and magnificent divine abode, containing all objects and means of delight suited to him, is indescribable and inconceivable; all these are eternal and perfect.

१९९. "वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तम् आदित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्", "य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषः.....तस्य यथा कप्यासं पुण्डरीकमेवमक्षिणी", "स य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः तस्मिन्नयं पुरुषो मनोमयः अमृतो हिरण्मयः". "मनोमयः" इति मनसैव विशुद्धेन गृह्यते इत्यर्थः। "सर्वे निमेषा जज्ञिरे विद्युतः पुरुषादधि" विद्युद्वर्णात् पुरुषादित्यर्थः।

**199.** The texts are as follows: 'I know this great Puruṣa, who is of the colour of the sun, and is beyond all darkness (*Pu.* 20);' 'He, who dwells within the sun, having a form as

if made of gold....has eyes like the lotus just opening at sunrise (*Chā. I, vi,* 8);' 'In the space of the heart resides this Puruṣa, abounding in mind, immortal and resplendent (*Tai. I, vi,* 1)'. 'Abounding in mind' means that he can be apprehended only by a pure mind. 'All moments originated from the Puruṣa, brilliant like lightning (*Mahā. I,* 2)'. The meaning is that the Puruṣa has the colour of lightning.

२००. "नीलतोयदमध्यस्था विद्युल्लेखेव भास्वरा" मध्यस्थनीलतोयदा विद्युल्लेखेव; सेयं दहरपुण्डरीकमध्यस्थाकाशवर्तिनी वह्निशिखा, स्वान्तर्निहितनीलतोयदाभपरमात्मस्वरूपा स्वान्तर्निहितनीलतोयदा विद्युदिव आभाति इत्यर्थः ।

**200.** 'Luminous like a streak of lightning enclosing a blue cloud (*Mahā.*).' This means that the subject spoken of is like a streak of lightning enclosing a blue cloud. The sentence as a whole means as follows: The flame burning in the space in the centre of the lotus of the heart has within it the supreme Self whose radiant colour is like that of a blue cloud. Therefore that flame bears resemblance to a streak of lightning enclosing a blue cloud.

२०१. "मनोमयः प्राणशरीरः भारूपः सत्यकामः सत्यसङ्कल्पः आकाशात्मा सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यनादरः", "महारजतं वासः" इत्याद्याः ।

**201.** 'Abounding in mind, having for his body prāṇa, luminous in form, with desires and will that always fulfil themselves, pure in nature like ākāśa, creating all as his own work, having all objects of desire, all fragrances and all tastes, he has taken possession of all this (universe), speechless and disinterested (*Chā. III, XIV,* 2);' 'His raiment is saffron-coloured (*Bṛ. IV, III,* 6)' etc.

२०२. "अस्येशाना जगतो विष्णुपत्नी", "ह्रीश्च ते लक्ष्मीश्च पत्न्यौ", "तद्विष्णोः परमं पदं सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः", "क्षयन्तमस्य रजसः पराके",

"यदेकमव्यक्तमनन्तरूपं विश्वं पुराणं तमसः परस्तात्", "यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन्", "योऽस्याध्यक्षः परमे व्योमन्", "तदेव भूतं तदु भव्यमा इदं तदक्षरं परमे व्योमन्" इत्यादिश्रुतिशतनिश्चितोऽयमर्थः ।

**202.** 'The Queen of this world is the consort of Viṣṇu (*Ya. IV*, *iv*, 12, 57);' 'Hri and Lakṣmī are his consorts (*Pu.* 24);' 'The highest abode of Viṣṇu, the enlightened seers always see (*Ya. VI*, 5);' 'He who lives beyond this rajas (*Ya. II*, *II*, 12);' 'That one, unmanifested, infinite, the totality of the universe, the primeval one, lives beyond tamas' (*Mahā.*); 'He who knows that which is treasured in the cavern, in the highest heavens (*Tai. II*, 1);' 'He who is the Lord of this is in the highest heavens (*Ṛg. X*, *cxxix*, 7);' 'He is in the highest imperishable heavens. He indeed is all this, all that is past, that will be in future and that is present. (*Mahā.*)'. Thus hundreds of śruti passages specifically embody these truths.

२०३. "तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम्" इति, विष्णोः परस्य ब्रह्मणः परमं पदं "सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः" इति वचनात् सर्वकालदर्शनवन्तः परिपूर्णज्ञानाः केचन सन्ति इति ज्ञायते । ये सूरयः ते सदा पश्यन्ति इति वचनव्यक्तिः । ये सदा पश्यन्ति ते सूरयः इति वा ।

**203.** The statement, 'The enlightened seers always see the supreme abode of Viṣṇu' meaning that the supreme abode of the Brahman is always seen by the enlightened seers, implies that there are some endowed with complete knowledge, who always see. The sentence may be construed either as, 'Those who are enlightened seers, always see', or as 'Those who always see, are enlighened seers'.

२०४. उभयपक्षेऽप्यनेकविधानं न सम्भवति इति चेत्, न; अप्राप्तत्वात् सर्वस्य सर्वविशिष्टं परमं स्थानं विधीयते । यथोक्तम्—"तद्गुणास्तु विधीयेरन् अविभागाद्विधानार्थे, न चेदन्येन शिष्टाः" इति । यथा "यदाग्नेयोऽष्टाकपालः" इत्यादिकर्मविधौ कर्मणो गुणानां च अप्राप्तत्वेन सर्वगुणविशिष्टं कर्म

विधीयते, तथा अत्रापि सूरिभिः सदा दृश्यत्वेन विष्णोः परं स्थानमप्राप्तं प्रतिपादयति इति न कश्चिद्विरोधः ।

**204.** **(Objection):** Now, on either interpretation, the proposition is taken as embodying two different assertions. That is not a correct view, as every proposition must embody a single assertion.

**(Reply):** As *all* the contents of the proposition are not established otherwise than by this proposition, we have to interpret it as affirming the transendent realm, as characterised by all else, which the proposition itself puts forward. (Such an interpretation is not uncommon in Vedic exegesis.) For instance, it is said, 'Its attributes are affirmed as there is no division in affirmation, provided they are not taken over from other sections (*Mī. I, iv*, 9)'. In the injunction concerning 'āgneya'-ritual of the nature of 'aṣṭākapāla' the ritual is enjoined, with all the particulars, specifically mentioned only by the injunction itself. The ritual in the specifically characterized mode, is prescribed. Similar is the situation in this passage which asserts the existence of the supreme abode of Viṣṇu as being perpetually seen by the enlightened seers. There is no contradiction in the method of interpretation adopted.

२०५. करणमन्त्राः क्रियमाणानुवादिनः स्तोत्रशस्त्ररूपाः जपादिषु विनियुक्ताश्च प्रकरणपठिताश्च अप्रकरणपठिताश्च स्वार्थं सर्वं यथावस्थितमेव अप्राप्तमविरुद्धं ब्राह्मणवत् बोधयन्ति इति हि वैदिकाः। विनियुक्तार्थप्रकाशिनां च देवतादिषु अप्राप्ताविरुद्धगुणविशेषप्रतिपादनं विनियोगानुगुणमेव ।

**205.** The followers of the Vedas maintain that the hymns, that are accessory to ritual action, describing the action under performance, of both the stotra and śastra types of hymns, and those which are for sacred repetition, whether they belong to the relevant section of the Vedas or are taken from elsewhere, do actually teach all that they affirm, like the

brāhmaṇa portions, provided what they affirm is not contradictory and is not given to us elsewhere. The texts throwing light on the act enjoined, subserve the purpose of the injunction itself, by describing the particulars about the deities etc., the particulars being free from contradiction and newly presented by the texts themselves under consideration.

२०६. नेयं श्रुतिः मुक्तजनविषया, तेषां सदा दर्शनानुपपत्तेः; नापि मुक्तप्रवाहविषया, "सदा पश्यन्ति" इत्येकैककर्तृविषयतया प्रतीतेः श्रुतिभङ्गप्रसङ्गात् । मन्त्रार्थवादगता ह्यर्थाः कार्यपरत्वेऽपि सिद्धयन्ति इत्युक्तम्; किं पुनः सिद्धवस्तुन्येव तात्पर्ये व्युत्पत्तिसिद्ध इति सर्वमुपपन्नम् ।

**206.** The present passage cannot be taken as referring to the liberated souls, for they do not *always* see the transcendent realm. Nor can it refer to the stream of liberated souls, for the śruti, maintaining that each individual seer always sees, would then be contradicted. We have already proved that the contents of even hymns and laudatory explanations, that are subordinate to the injunctions of sacred obligations, ought to be taken as revelatory of existent realities. *A fortiori* the import of directly existential passages, like the present one, can, without any contradiction, be taken as objectively veridical.

२०७. ननु चात्र "तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम्" इति परस्वरूपमेव परमपदशब्देन अभिधीयते, "समस्तहेयरहितं विष्ण्वाख्यं परमं पदम्" इत्यादिषु अव्यतिरेकदर्शनात् ।

नैवम्—"क्षयन्तमस्य रजसः पराके", "तदक्षरे परमे व्योमन्", "योऽस्याध्यक्षः परमे व्योमन्", "यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन्" इत्यादिषु परस्थानस्यैव दर्शनात्, "विष्णोः परमं पदम्" इति व्यतिरेकनिर्देशाच्च । "विष्ण्वाख्यं परमं पदम्" इति विशेषणात् अन्यदपि परमं पदं विद्यते इति तेनैव ज्ञायते, तदिदं परस्थानं सूरिभिः सदा दृश्यत्वेन प्रतिपाद्यते ।

**207.** **(Objection):** But the terms 'The supreme abode

of Viṣṇu' need not be taken as referring to any realm. The very nature of Viṣṇu is represented as the supreme abode. No distinction is made between Viṣṇu and his realm in texts like, 'The highest abode called Viṣṇu, free from all evil (*Vi, I, xii,* 53)'.

**(Reply):** This is not the correct position. The texts, 'He who lives beyond this rajas (*Ya. II, ii,* 12)', 'In that imperishable highest heavens', 'He, who is the lord of this, in the highest heavens (*Ṛg. X, cxxix,* 7)' and 'He who knows that one treasured in the cavern, in the highest heavens (*Tai. II,* 1)' definitely proclaim the existence of the highest abode. The very description of it as Viṣṇu's abode points to the realm as different from Viṣṇu. Even in the text adduced, the qualification 'The highest abode called Viṣṇu' proves that there is another highest abode, not one in substance with Viṣṇu. It is this abode that is described as being always seen by the enlightened seers.

२०८. एतदुक्तं भवति—क्वचित् परस्थानं च परमपदशब्देन प्रतिपाद्यते; क्वचित् प्रकृतिवियुक्तात्मस्वरूपम्; क्वचित् भगवत्स्वरूपम् । "तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम्" इति परस्थानम्; "सर्गस्थित्यन्तकालेषु त्रिधैवं सम्प्रवर्तते, गुणप्रवृत्त्या परमं पदं तस्यागुणं महत्" इत्यत्र प्रकृतिवियुक्तात्मस्वरूपम्; "समस्तहेयरहितं विष्ण्वाख्यं परमं पदम्" इत्यत्र भगवत्स्वरूपम्; । त्रीण्यप्येतानि परमप्राप्यत्वेन परमपदशब्देन प्रतिपाद्यन्ते ।

**208.** The whole matter may be elucidated as follows: In some texts, the highest abode is designated by the term 'parama-pada', in some, the nature of the individual self freed from matter, and in some, the very nature of the Bhagavān is designated 'parama-pada'. The text 'parama-pada of Viṣṇu' illustrates the usage in relation to the highest abode. The text 'His attributeless and great "parama-pada" undergoes threefold modification, owing to the action of the three attributes of matter, at the periods of creation, maintenance

and destruction (*Vi. I, xxiii*, 41)' clearly speaks of the nature of the individual self freed from matter. The text 'Free from evil, that parama-pada, called Viṣṇu (*Vi. I, xxii*, 53)' is speaking of the nature of Bhagavān. Now, all these three, (the highest realm, the pure status of the individual and the Lord) are the supreme ideals to be attained. Hence they are described as 'parama-pada'.

२०९. कथं त्रयाणां परमप्राप्यत्वमिति चेत्, भगवत्स्वरूपं परमप्राप्यत्वादेव परमं पदम्; इतरयोरपि भगवत्प्राप्तिगर्भत्वादेव परमपदत्वम् । सर्वकर्मविनिर्मुक्तात्मस्वरूपावाप्तिः भगवत्प्राप्तिगर्भा "त इमे सत्याः कामाः अनृतापिधानाः" इति भगवतो गुणगणस्य तिरोधायकत्वेन अनृतशब्देन स्वकर्मणः प्रतिपादनात् ।

अनृतरूपतिरोधानं क्षेत्रज्ञकर्मेति कथमवगम्यते इति चेत्;

अविद्या कर्मसंज्ञान्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते ।
यया क्षेत्रज्ञशक्तिः सा वेष्टिता नृप सर्वगा ॥
संसारतापानखिलान् अवाप्नोत्यतिसन्ततान् ।
तया तिरोहितत्वाच्च.......... ॥

इत्यादिवचनात्; परस्थानप्राप्तिरपि भगवत्प्राप्तिगर्भैव इति सुव्यक्तम् ।

**209.** 'How can all the three be supreme ideals, the *summum bonum*?' If this be asked, we answer thus: The Lord is primarily the supreme ideal to be attained, and therefore he is the 'parama-pada'. The other two are included as constituent factors in the attainment of the Bhagavān. Hence they are designated 'parama-pada'. The realization by the individual self of its real nature, through emancipation from the bondage of karma is included in the attainment of the Supreme. The text, 'These eternal perfections are veiled by evil (*Chā. VIII, iii*, 1)' intimates that the auspicious attributes of the Bhagavān are veiled from the view of the individual self by its own karma. If it be asked how it is known that the individual's karma is the evil that conceals

the Supreme, we cite the following textual authority: 'There is the third power, avidyā, called karma, by which power, the all-penetrating power of the individual self is covered up, and thus covered up, the individual gets enmeshed in all the persisting afflictions of bondage (*Vi. VII*, 61-62)'. Even the ascent to the highest abode is included as a factor in the attainment of the Bhagavān.

२१०. "क्षयन्तमस्य रजसः पराके" इति रजश्शब्देन त्रिगुणात्मिका प्रकृतिरुच्यते, केवलस्य रजसोऽनवस्थानात्; इमां त्रिगुणात्मिकां प्रकृतिमतिक्रम्य स्थिते स्थाने क्षयन्तं वसन्तम् इत्यर्थः । अनेन त्रिगुणात्मकात् क्षेत्रज्ञस्य भोग्यभूतात् वस्तुनः परस्तात् विष्णोः वासस्थानमिति गम्यते । "वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तम् आदित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्" इत्यत्रापि तमश्शब्देन सैव प्रकृतिः उच्यते; केवलस्य तमसः अनवस्थानादेव, "रजसः पराके क्षयन्तम्" इत्यनेन एकवाक्यत्वात्; तमसः परस्तात् वसन्तं महान्तम् आदित्यवर्णं पुरुषम् अहं वेद इत्ययमर्थः अवगम्यते ।

**210.** In the passage, 'He who lives beyond this rajas (*Ya. II, II*, 12)', the term 'rajas' signifies nature that abounds in the three qualities of sattva, rajas and tamas. This extension of meaning follows from the fact that pure rajas does not exist by itself. The passage, therefore, asserts that he exists in the abode, that transcends the natural realm of three qualities. From this it is understood that Viṣṇu's abode is beyond objects characterized by the three qualities, forming the objects of experience of the individual selves. Again in the passage, 'I know this great Person, resplendent like the sun, beyond tamas (*Pu.* 20)', the word 'tamas' signifies the empirical nature distinguished by the three qualities. This extension of meaning also follows from the principle that pure tamas cannot exist by itself and the statement has oneness of import with the previous one speaking of the abode beyond rajas. The present text means, 'I know this great Person, resplendent like the sun, beyond tamas'.

२११. "सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन्", "तदक्षरे परमे व्योमन्" इति तत् स्थानम् अविकाररूपं परमव्योमशब्दाभिधेयमिति च गम्यते। "अक्षरे परमे व्योमन्" इत्यस्य स्थानस्य अक्षरत्वश्रवणात् क्षररूपादित्यमण्डलादयः न परमव्योमशब्दाभिधेयाः।

**211.** Again in the two texts, 'Brahman is real, knowledge and infinite, and he who knows this as treasured in the cavern, in the highest heavens (*Tai. II*, 1)' and 'In that imperishable highest heavens (*Mahā.*)', that realm is characterized as immutable and is designated the highest heavens. By the phrase 'imperishable highest heavens', the imperishable character of that realm is affirmed and hence it cannot be any perishable region like the orb of the sun. The description, therefore, of it as the highest heavens cannot apply to such perishing situations.

२१२. "यत्र पूर्वे साध्याः सन्ति देवाः", "यत्र ऋषयः प्रथमजा ये पुराणाः" इत्यादिषु च त एव सूरय इति गम्यते। "तद्विप्रासो विपन्यवो जागृवांसः समिन्धते विष्णोर्यत्परमं पदम्" इत्यत्रापि, 'विप्रासः' मेधाविनः, 'विपन्यवः' स्तुतिशीलाः, 'जागृवांसः' अस्खलितज्ञानाः; त एव अस्खलितज्ञानाः तत् विष्णोः परमं पदं सदा स्तुवन्तः समिन्धते इत्यर्थः।

**212.** In the same way, in the texts 'Where the ancient sādhyas and the devas are (*Pu.* 18)' and 'Where the first-born, primordial ṛṣis are (*Ya. II*, 60)' the perfect seers are spoken of. The passage 'The seers of intelligence, given to praise and of unfailing knowledge flourish glorifying that supreme abode of Viṣṇu', also speaks of the same matter. It means that there are seers of supreme intelligence, devoted to praise, whose understanding never fails and that they always sing of the glories of this abode of Viṣṇu and thus flourish.

२१३. एतेषां परिजनस्थानादीनां "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यत्र ज्ञानबलैश्वर्यादिकल्याणगुणगणवत् परब्रह्मस्वरूपान्तर्भूतत्वात्, "सदेव......

एकमेव अद्वितीयम्" इति ब्रह्मान्तर्भावः अवगम्यते एषामपि कल्याणगुणैक-देशत्वादेव । "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यत्र 'इदम्' इति शब्दस्य कर्मवश्यभोक्तृवर्गमिश्रतद्भोग्यभूतविषयत्वाच्च "सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः" इति सदार्दाशत्वेन च तेषां कर्मवश्यानन्तर्भावात् ।

**213.** Now this abode and seers of timeless vision are included in the being of the Supreme, even as his attributes like knowledge and power are; and these, like the attributes, are incorporated in text, 'Being alone, this was in the beginning (*Chā. VI, ii,* 1)' as forming an element in the being of Brahman. They are taken as included in the significance of the term, 'Being alone, one without a second', for ultimately they constitute a part of the glorious attributes of the supreme Brahman. In the passage, 'Being alone, this was in the beginning' the term 'this' denoted the individual selves governed by karma and the objects of their experience. In the text, 'The enlightened seers always see (*Ya. VI,* 5)', these being timeless seers, are shown to be not included among the individual selves governed by karma.

२१४. "अपहतपाप्मा" इत्यादि "अपिपासः" इत्यन्तेन स्वलीलोप-करणभूतत्रिगुणात्मकप्रकृतिप्राकृततत्संसृष्टपुरुषगतं हेयस्वभावं सर्वं प्रतिषिध्य, "सत्यकामः" इत्यनेन स्वभोग्यभोगोपकरणजातस्य सर्वस्य नित्यता प्रति-पादिता । सत्याः कामाः यस्य असौ सत्यकामः । काम्यन्ते इति कामाः, तेन परेण ब्रह्मणा स्वभोग्यतदुपकरणादयः स्वाभिमताः ये काम्यन्ते, ते सत्याः नित्या इत्यर्थः । अन्यस्य लीलोपकरणस्यापि वस्तुनः प्रमाणसम्बन्धयोग्यत्वे सत्यपि विकारास्पदत्वेन अस्थिरत्वात्, तद्विपरीतं स्थिरत्वम् एषां "सत्य"-पदेन उच्यते ।

**214.** In the passage, 'That is the self, free from sin, ageless, deathless, griefless, free from hunger and thirst, whose desires are satya and whose will is satya', beginning with the first epithet, 'free from sin' upto 'free from thirst', the evil

characteristics of prakṛti with its threefold properties, its products and the individual selves caught up in prakṛti—all the three forming instruments of his cosmic play—are denied of Brahman. Then the term 'satyakāma' occurs. The term signifies that entities which are objects and instruments of divine joy are eternal. Satyakāma is one whose desires are real. Desire (kama) means whatever is desired. Whatever entities are desired by the supreme Brahman as objects and instruments of his joy are said to be satya *i.e.*, eternal. The instruments of his cosmic play, though real, being cognizable through valid means of cognition, are subject to change and therefore are not abiding. In contrast to them, these objects and instruments of divine (nitya) joy are abiding. The term 'satya' connotes this abiding nature of these entities.

२१५. 'सत्यसङ्कल्पः' इति एतेषु भोगतदुपकरणादिषु नित्येषु निरतिशयेषु अनन्तेषु सत्स्वपि, अपूर्वाणाम् अपरिमितानाम् अर्थानामपि सङ्कल्पमात्रेण सिद्धि वदति । एषां च भोगोपकरणानां लीलोपकरणानां चेतनानाम् अचेतनानां स्थिराणामस्थिराणां च, सत्सङ्कल्पायत्तास्वरूपस्थितिप्रवृत्तिभेदादिसर्वं वदति 'सत्यसङ्कल्पः' इति ।

**215.** The epithet 'satya-saṅkalpa' brings out the idea that, even though these objects and instruments of divine joy are eternal, unsurpassed and limitless, other entities, creations new and measureless, are brought into existence by his mere will. The term 'satya-saṅkalpa' serves to enunciate that these objects and instruments of divine joy (nitya) and divine play (lila) sentient and non-sentient, unchanging and changing, have their nature, existence, activities and differentiations, sustained and controlled by the will of the Supreme.

२१६. इतिहासपुराणयोः वेदोपबृंहणयोश्च अयमर्थः उच्यते—

तौ तु मेधाविनौ दृष्ट्वा वेदेषु परिनिष्ठितौ ।
वेदोपबृंहणार्थाय तावग्राहयत प्रभुः ।। इति ।

वेदोपबृंहणतया प्रारब्धे श्रीरामायणे —

व्यक्तमेष महायोगी परमात्मा सनातनः ।
अनादिमध्यनिधनः महतः परमो महान् ॥
तमसः परमो धाता शङ्खचक्रगदाधरः ।
श्रीवत्सवक्षाः नित्यश्रीः अजय्यः शाश्वतो ध्रुवः ॥
शरा नानाविधाश्चापि धनुरायतविग्रहम् ।
अन्वगच्छन्त काकुत्स्थं सर्वे पुरुषविग्रहाः ॥
विवेश वैष्णवं धाम सशरीरः सहानुगः ।

**216.** The itihāsas and purāṇas, works seeking to augment the Vedas, embody the same truth: *Śrī Rāmāyaṇa* undertakes to augment the Vedas as evidenced by the opening, 'The master, seeing those two brilliant pupils, well established in the Vedas, took them up for purposes of reinforcing the Vedas (*Bālakāṇḍa, IV*, 6)'. *Śrī-Rāmāyaṇa* goes on: 'It is clear that this is the great yogin, the supreme Self, the primordial One. He is without a beginning, middle and end. He greatly surpasses whatever is great. He is beyond tamas. He is the creator. He wears the conch, the discus and the mace. There is śrīvatsa-mark on his chest and goddess Śrī eternally belongs to him. He is unconquerable, eternal and everlasting (*Yuddhakāṇḍa, CXIV*, 14-15).' And again, 'The various arrows of many kinds and the bow, assumed personal forms and followed Śrī Rāma, the descendent of Kakutstha (*Uttarakāṇḍa, CIX*, 2)'. 'He, even as embodied, passed into the realm of Viṣṇu, with all his followers (*Uttarakāṇḍa, CX*, 12)'.

२१७. श्रीमद्वैष्णवे पुराणे —

समस्ताः शक्तयश्चैताः नृप यत्र प्रतिष्ठिताः ।
तद्विश्वरूपवैरूप्यं रूपमन्यद्धरेर्महत् ॥
मूर्तं ब्रह्म महाभाग सर्वब्रह्ममयो हरिः ।
नित्यैवैषा जगन्माता विष्णोः श्रीरनपायिनी ।

यथा सर्वगतो विष्णुः तथैवेयं द्विजोत्तम ॥
देवत्वे देवदेहेयं मनुष्यत्वे च मानुषी ।
विष्णोः देहानुरूपां वै करोत्येषात्मनस्तनुम् ॥
एकान्तिनः सदा ब्रह्मध्यायिनो योगिनो हि ये ।
तेषां तत् परमं स्थानं यद्वै पश्यन्ति सूरयः ॥
कलामुहूर्तादिमयश्च कालः न यद्विभूतेः परिणामहेतुः ।

**217.** *Śrī-Viṣṇupurāṇa* says: 'O King, that majestic form of Viṣṇu is different. It transcends all the forms of the universe. In that transcendent form are established all the powers (*Vi. VII*, 70). That is the Brahman in form, O great one; Hari has, as contained in himself, all individual selves that are perfect (*Vi. I, xxii*, 63). This Śrī, the Mother of the universe, is eternal and knows no separation from Viṣṇu. Even as Viṣṇu is all-pervading, she is all-pervading (*Vi. I, viii*, 17). When he becomes a deva, she assumes the deva-form. When he becomes a man, she too becomes a human being. She makes her form conform to the form of Viṣṇu (*Vi. I, ix*, 145). Those who are yogins, who meditate on Brahman always and whose devotion is undivided, attain to the supreme abode, which the enlightened seers always see (*Vi. I, vi*, 38). Time, consisting of kalā, muhūrta, etc., cannot cause modification in that glorious manifestation (*Vi. IV, i*, 84)'

२१८. महाभारते च—
दिव्यं स्थानमजरं चाप्रमेयं दुर्विज्ञेयं चागमैर्गम्यमाद्यम् ।
गच्छ प्रभो रक्ष चास्मान् प्रपन्नान् कल्पे कल्पे जायमानः स्वमूर्त्या ॥
कालस्सम्पच्यते तत्र न कालस्तत्र वै प्रभुः ॥ इति ।

**218.** The *Mahābhārata* says: 'O Lord, go thou to that celestial, ageless, immeasurable, incomprehensible and primordial realm, knowable through the scriptures; by taking births in epoch after epoch in thy transcendent form, protect us, thy self-surrendering devotees. There, time is not the master, rather it is subdued there'.

२१९. परस्य ब्रह्मणो रूपवत्त्वं सूत्रकारश्च वदति—
"अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात्" इति ।

**219.** That the supreme Brahman has a transcendent form is established by the Sūtrakāra in the *Sūtra*: 'The one proclaimed as dwelling in the sun and the eye is he, as his attributes are proclaimed (*Bra. I, i,* 21)'. (The *Sūtra* contends that he, whose form is praised in the text under discussion, is the ultimate Brahman himself.)

२२०. योऽसावादित्यमण्डलान्तर्वर्ती, तप्तकार्तस्वरगिरिवरप्रभः, सहस्रांशुशतसहस्रकिरणः, गम्भीराम्भःसमुद्भूतसुमृष्टनालरविकरविकसितपुण्डरीकदलामलायतेक्षणः, सुभ्रूललाटः, सुनासः, सुस्मिताधरविद्रुमः, सुरुचिरकोमलगण्डः, कम्बुग्रीवः, समुन्नतांसविलम्बिचारुरूपदिव्यकर्णकिसलयः, पीनवृत्तायतभुजः, चारुतराताम्रकरतलानुरक्ताङ्गुलीभिः अलङ्कृतः, तनुमध्यः, विशालवक्षःस्थलः समविभक्तसर्वाङ्गः, अनिर्देश्यदिव्यरूपसंहननः, स्निग्धवर्णः, प्रबुद्धपुण्डरीकचारुचरणयुगलः, स्वानुरूपपीताम्बरधरः, अमलकिरीटकुण्डलहारकौस्तुभकेयूरकटकनूपुरोदरबन्धनाद्यपरिमिताश्चर्यानन्तदिव्यभूषणः, शङ्खचक्रगदासिशार्ङ्गश्रीवत्सवनमालालङ्कृतः, अनवधिकातिशयसौन्दर्याहृताशेषमनोदृष्टिवृत्तिः, लावण्यामृतपूरिताशेषचराचरभूतजातः, अत्यद्भुताचिन्त्यनित्ययौवनः, पुष्पहाससुकुमारः, पुण्यगन्धवासितानन्तदिगन्तरालः, त्रैलोक्याक्रमणप्रवृत्तगम्भीरभावः, करुणानुरागमधुरलोचनावलोकिताश्रितवर्गः पुरुषवरो दरीदृश्यते; स च निखिलजगदुदयविभवलयलीलः, निरस्तसमस्तहेयः, समस्तकल्याणगुणनिधिः स्वेतरसमस्तवस्तुविलक्षणः परमात्मा परं ब्रह्म नारायणः इत्यवगम्यते ।

**220.** His lustre is that of a fine mountain of molten gold· He has the splendour of a hundred thousand suns. His pure eyes have the beauty of the petals of a lotus, just unfolding under the rays of the sun and crowning a rich stalk, that has sprung up in deep waters. His brows and forehead and nose are charming. His coral-like lips radiate a pure smile. His cheeks are tender and radiant. His neck is lovely like a conch. His exquisitely tender ear-lobes are almost touching

his high shoulders. His arms are well-developed, round and long. His beautiful and roseate palms are adorned with fingers of the same hue. His waist is slender and chest broad. All parts of his person are proportionate and symmetrical. The divine harmony of his features beggars all description. His complexion is effulgent. His lovely feet are like full-blown lotus. His gold-hued raiment eminently suits his person. He is adorned by pure, divine and infinitely marvellous ornaments like kirīṭa, kuṇḍala, hāra, kaustubha, keyūra, kaṭaka, nūpura, and udara-bandhana. He is also bedecked with the conch, discus, mace, sword, bow, śrīvatsa and vanamāla. He has captivated the eyes and hearts of all by his surpassingly sublime beauty. The nectar of his pervasive loveliness fills and overflows all existence, sentient and non-sentient. His eternal and inconceivable youthfulness is infinitely marvellous. He has the delicate freshness of smiling blossoms. The endless expanse of the universe is perfumed by his holy fragrance. He shines in his supreme majesty as he envelopes the three worlds. He looks at his devotees with a look of compassion, love and sweetness. This supreme Person, seen within the sun is the ultimate one who sports, through the creation, maintenance and dissolution of the whole world, who is antithetical to all evil, who is an ocean of all auspicious attributes and who stands unique above all other entities. He is the supreme Brahman, the highest Self, Nārāyaṇa.

२२१. "तद्धर्मोपदेशात्", "स एष सर्वेषां लोकनामीशः सर्वेषां कामानाम्", "स एष सर्वेभ्यः पाप्मभ्य उदितः" इत्यादिदर्शनात् । तस्यैते गुणाः, "सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः", "अपहतपाप्मा विजरः" इत्यादि "सत्यसङ्कल्पः" इत्यन्तं, "विश्वतः परमं नित्यं विश्वं नारायणं हरिम्", "पतिं विश्वस्यात्मेश्वरम्" इत्यादिवाक्यप्रतिपादिताः ।

**221.** This is supported by the following: 'The one proclaimed as dwelling in the sun and the eye is he, as his

attributes are proclaimed (*Bra. I, I,, 21*);' 'He is the Lord of all the worlds and all objects of desire;' 'He rises beyond all sins (*Chā. I, vi, 7*)'. To him belong the attributes enunciated in the following texts: 'He is the ruler of all, the Lord of all (*Bṛ, IV, iv, 22*);' and the text commencing with 'He is free from sin and ageless' and concluding with 'His will fulfils itself without fail (*Chā. viii, I, 5*)'. 'Nārāyaṇa, is great beyond the universe, he is eternal, he is all; he is Hari (*Mahā.*);' 'The lord of the universe and the individual selves (*Mahā,*).'

२२२. वाक्यकारश्चैतत् सुस्पष्टमाह—"हिरण्मयः पुरुषो दृश्यते" इति प्राज्ञस्सर्वान्तरस्स्यात् लोककामेशोपदेशात् तथोदयात्पाप्मनाम् इत्यादिना । तस्य च रूपस्य अनित्यतादि वाक्यकारेणैव प्रतिषिद्धम्; "स्याद्रूपं कृतकमनुग्रहार्थं तच्चेतसामैश्वर्यात्" इति उपासितुः अनुग्रहार्थः परमपुरुषस्य रूपसङ्ग्रहः इति पूर्वपक्षं कृत्वा, "रूपं वातीन्द्रियमन्तःकरणप्रत्यक्षनिर्देशात्" इति यथा ज्ञानादयः परस्य ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपतया निर्देशात् स्वरूपभूता गुणाः, तथा इदमपि रूपं श्रुत्या स्वरूपतया निर्देशात् स्वरूपभूतमित्यर्थः ।

**222.** The Vākyakāra clearly states this: 'The text, "The Puruṣa of the golden form is seen" is speaking of the omnicient one, the inmost soul of all; for the texts speak of him as being the Lord of the worlds and desires and as transcending the sins'. He himself repudiates the suggestion that the form is temporal. He takes note of the objection, 'The form may be artificial being assumed to favour the individual self, as it is possible for the omnipotent Lord to assume such forms'. This *prima facie* view means that the form is taken by the supreme Puruṣa for favouring graciously those who meditate on him. He answers, 'But His form is real and supersensuous,' because the śrutis state that it is perceptible to the inner eye'. His meaning is that just as knowledge etc. are taken as inherent attributes of the supreme Brahman, because they are so stated in the scriptures, this

form also, described as inherent to the supreme Brahman, must be so taken.

२२३. भाष्यकारेण एतद्व्याख्यातम्—"अञ्जसैव विश्वसृजो रूपं तत्तु न चक्षुषा ग्राह्यं, मनसा त्वकलुषेण साधनान्तरवता गृह्यते, 'न चक्षुषा गृह्यते नापि वाचा मनसा तु विशुद्धेन' इति श्रुतेः; न हि अरूपाया देवताया रूपमुपदिश्यते, यथाभूतवादि हि शास्त्रम्; 'महारजतं वासः', 'वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तम् आदित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्' इति प्रकरणान्तरनिर्देशाच्च साक्षिणः" इत्यादिना ।

**223.** The Bhāṣyakāra (Dramiḍācārya) comments as follows: 'Inherent and natural is the form of the creator. But it is not perceptible to the eye. It is perceptible only to the purified mind equipped with the other spiritual means. The Vedic text lays down, "He is not apprehended through the eye. He is not within the reach of speech. But he is apprehended through a pure mind (*Mu. III*, 8)". The form of the Deity inherently formless is not taught in the śāstra. The śāstra verily speaks the truth. There is the evidence of other sections: "His raiment is saffron-coloured (*Bṛ. IV iii*, 6)" and "I know this great Puruṣa resplendent like the sun transcending all darkness (*Pu.* 20)".'

२२४. "हिरण्मय इति रूपसामान्यात् चन्द्रमुखवत्". "न मयडत्र विकारमादाय प्रयुज्यते, अनारभ्यत्वादात्मनः" इति ।

**224.** The Vākyakāra says: 'The Supreme is spoken of "as of golden form (Hiraṇmaya)" on the ground of likeness of lustre, as in the case of the expression, "moon-faced".' The Bhāṣyakāra also says: 'The *mayaṭ* suffix does not signify that the Puruṣa is a modification of gold, for the ātman is not a product.'

२२५. यथा ज्ञानादिकल्याणगुणानन्त्यनिर्देशात् अपरिमितकल्याणगुणविशिष्टं परं ब्रह्मेत्यवगम्यते, एवम्, "आदित्यवर्णं पुरुषम्" इत्यादिनिर्देशात्

**स्वाभिमतस्वानुरूपकल्याणतमरूपः परब्रह्मभूतः पुरुषोत्तमो नारायण इति ज्ञायते; तथा "अस्येशाना", "ह्रीश्च ते लक्ष्मीश्च पत्न्यौ", "सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः", "तमसः परस्तात्", "क्षयन्तमस्य रजसः पराके" इत्यादिना पत्नि-परिजनस्थानादीनां निर्देशादेव तथैव सन्तीत्यवगम्यते । यथाह भाष्यकारः "यथाभूतवादि हि शास्त्रम्" इति ।**

**225.** Just as, on the strength of the holy texts asserting the infinite auspicious attributes of Brahman like jnāña, the supreme Brahman is admitted to be characterized by countless hosts of auspicious attributes, on the strength of the same holy texts like the one which describes him as 'Puruṣa resplendent like the sun', the supreme Puruṣa, Nārāyaṇa, must be admitted as possessing the most auspicious and sublime form, at once pleasing to him and worthy of him. Similarly on the basis of texts like 'The Queen of this world (*Ya. IV, vii,* 39)', 'Hrī and Lakṣmī are your consorts (*Pu.* 24)', 'The enlightened seers always see', 'He is beyond tamas (*Pu.* 20)', and 'He lives beyond this rajas', which speak of his divine consorts, servants and abode, they are to be admitted as realities. As the Bhāṣyakāra observes, 'The śāstra verily speaks the truth'.

**२२६. एतदुक्तं भवति—यथा "सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म" इति निर्देशात् परमात्मस्वरूपं समस्तहेयप्रत्यनीकानवधिकानन्दैकतानतया अपरिच्छेद्यतया च सकलेतरविलक्षणं, तथा "यस्सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्", "परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च", "तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति" इत्यादिनिर्देशात् निरतिशयासङ्ख्येयाश्च गुणाः सकलेतर-विलक्षणाः; तथा "आदित्यवर्णम्" इत्यादिनिर्देशात् रूपपरिजनस्थानादयश्च सकलेतरविलक्षणः स्वासाधारणाः अनिर्देश्यस्वरूपस्वभावाः इति ।**

**226.** The matter stands this way: Just as, on the authority of texts like 'Brahman is real, knowledge and infinite (*Tai. II,* 1)', the substantive nature of the supreme

Self is recognised as unique, transcending all else, being opposed to all evil, of the nature of absolute bliss and infinite, even so, on the authority of texts like 'He knows all, cognizes all (*Mu. II, ii,* 7)', 'His supreme manifold power and his inherent knowledge, strength and activity are spoken of in the Vedas (*Śve. VI,* 7)' and 'He is luminous and all things shine after him, the luminous one. Through his radiance does all this shine (*Ka. II, v,* 15)', Brahman is to be recognised as distinguished by unsurpassed and countless excellences which are his unique attributes; similarly, on the authority of texts like 'The Puruṣa resplendent like the sun', his (divine) form, (eternal) devotees and (transcendent) abode, which are unique and indescribable, must be recognized.

२२७. वेदाः प्रमाणं चेत्, विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रगतं सर्वम् अपूर्वम् अविरुद्धम् अर्थजातं यथावस्थितमेव बोधयन्ति । प्रामाण्यं च वेदानाम् "औत्पत्तिकस्तु शब्दस्यार्थेन सम्बन्धः" इत्युक्तम्; यथा अग्निजलादीनाम् औष्ण्यादिशक्तियोगः स्वाभाविकः, यथा च चक्षुरादीनाम् इन्द्रियाणां बुद्धिविशेषजननशक्तिः स्वाभाविकी, तथा शब्दस्यापि बोधकत्वशक्तिः स्वाभाविकी ।

**227.** If the Vedas are the sources of valid knowledge, they truly teach all that is contained in the injunctions, explanations and hymns, provided they transcend other sources of knowledge and are free from contradiction. The truth of the Vedas is affirmed in the aphorism, 'The relation of words to facts is natural (*Mī. I, i,* 7)'. Just as fire and water do naturally possess their properties like heat, just as the senses like sight and hearing are naturally productive of particular kinds of cognition, the words also have a natural power of imparting knowledge.

२२८. न च हस्तचेष्टादिवत् सङ्केतमूलं शब्दस्य बोधकत्वम् इति वक्तुं शक्यम् अनाद्यनुसन्धानाविच्छेदेऽपि सङ्केतयितृपुरुषाज्ञानात्; यानि सङ्केतमूलानि तानि सर्वाणि साक्षाद्वा परम्परया वा ज्ञायन्ते । न च देवदत्तादिशब्दवत्

कल्पयितुं युक्तम्; तेषु च साक्षाद्वा परम्परया वा सङ्केतो ज्ञायते; गवादिशब्दानां तु अनाद्यनुसन्धानाविच्छेदेऽपि सङ्केताज्ञानादेव बोधकत्वशक्तिः स्वाभाविकी । अतः अग्न्यादीनाम् औष्ण्यादिशक्तिवत् इन्द्रियाणां बोधकत्वशक्तिवच्च, शब्दस्यापि बोधकत्वशक्तिः आश्रयणीया ।

**228.** It is not reasonable to maintain that the signifying power of words is due to arbitrary conventions set up by men as in the case of gesture. This is proved by the fact that there is unbroken continuity of linguistic tradition from beginningless past, and there is no historical knowledge regarding the founding of such fresh and arbitrary conventions. Wherever there is such setting up of conventions, there is either direct or indirect knowledge bearing on the initiation of such conventions. The significance of all terms cannot be construed on the analogy of proper names like 'Devadatta'. In relation to the latter type of words, there is either direct or indirect information on the fixing of such names. In the case of terms like 'cow' there is an unbroken tradition of usage from beginningless past and yet, there is no knowledge of any definite foundation of arbitrary symbolism. Hence, as fire etc., have their inherent properties like heat, and as the particular sense-organs originate cognition about particular aspects of nature, we are obliged to acknowledge that the power of words to signify is natural.

२२९. ननु च इन्द्रियवत् शब्दस्यापि बोधकत्वं स्वाभाविकं सम्बन्धग्रहणं बोधकत्वाय किमिति अपेक्षते? लिङ्गवत् इत्युच्यते; यथा ज्ञातसम्बन्धनियमं धूमादि अग्न्यादिविज्ञानजनकं, तथा ज्ञातसम्बन्धनियमः शब्दोऽपि अर्थविशेषबुद्धिजनकः । एवं तर्हि, शब्दोऽपि अर्थविशेषस्य लिङ्गमिति अनुमानमेव स्यात्; नैवम्; शब्दार्थयोः सम्बन्धः बोध्यबोधकभाव एव; धूमादीनां तु सम्बन्धान्तरमिति, तस्य सम्बन्धस्य ज्ञानद्वारेण बुद्धिजनकत्वमिति विशेषः ।

**229.** It may be asked in objection, why there is a necessity to learn the connection of particular words with particular

meanings, if their power of giving information is natural and inherent, on the analogy of sense-organs. We reply that the necessity arises as in the case of the inferential mark (middle term). The smoke originates the thought of fire only through the understanding of the connection between smoke and fire. Even so a term originates thought of a particular object only through the understanding of its connection with its proper meaning. 'If so', it may be said, 'words being nothing but inferential marks of meanings, apprehension originating from verbal testimony is merely a species of inference'. We answer that the case is not so. The words are related to things as signifiers to the signified. The relation of smoke to fire etc., is relation of another type. It is through knowledge of that relationship that words have the power of originating knowledge.

२३०. एवं गृहीतसम्बन्धस्य बोधकत्वदर्शनात् अनाद्यनुसन्धानाविच्छेदेऽपि सङ्केताज्ञानात् बोधकत्वशक्तिरेवेति निश्चीयते । एवं बोधकानां पदसङ्घातानां संसर्गविशेषबोधकत्वेन वाक्यशब्दाभिधेयानाम् उच्चारणक्रमो यत्र पुरुषबुद्धिपूर्वकः, ते पौरुषेयाः शब्दा इत्युच्यन्ते; यत्र तु उच्चारणक्रमः पूर्वपूर्वोच्चारणक्रमजनितसंस्कारपूर्वकः सर्वदा अपौरुषेयाः ते च वेदाः इत्युच्यन्ते ।

**230.** Thus, the relationship between words and their meaning being understood, their power to cause the thought of things must be admitted to be natural as there is unbroken tradition of usage from immemorial past and yet there is no knowledge of the foundation of any arbitrary symbolism. Thus the power of words to convey meaning being natural, groups of words, conveying particular combinations of such meanings, are described as sentences. All cases in which the words are uttered in the order arranged by human intelligence are called 'personal'. Those cases are always said to be impersonal and constitutive of the Vedas in which the order

of words in utterance is governed by the culture born of a prior recitation.

२३१. एतदेव वेदानामपौरुषेयत्वं नित्यत्वं च, यत् पूर्वपूर्वोच्चारणक्रमजनितसंस्कारेण तमेव क्रमविशेषं स्मृत्वा तेनैव क्रमेण उच्चार्यमाणत्वम् । ते च आनुपूर्वीविशेषेण संस्थिताः अक्षरराशयो वेदाः ऋग्यजुस्सामाथर्वभेदभिन्नाः अनन्तशाखा वर्तन्ते; ते च विध्यर्थवादमन्त्ररूपाः वेदाः परब्रह्मभूतनारायणस्वरूपं तदाराधनप्रकारम् आराधितात् फलविशेषं च बोधयन्ति । परमपुरुषवत्, तत्स्वरूप - तदाराधन - तत्फलज्ञापक - वेदाख्यं शब्दजातं नित्यमेव ।

**231.** This is what is meant by the impersonal character and eternality of the Vedas. This impersonal character and eternality may be defined in the following manner: A body of words is said to possess impersonal character and eternality, if their order of utterance conforms to a pre-established order and proceeds from a remembrance of that order, which arises from the culture shaped by the prior practice of utterance in the same order. This order is being maintained by the tradition of recitation. The group of words, so preserved in a fixed order, constitute the Vedas divided into *Ṛk*, *Yajus*, *Sāman*, *Atharvan*, containing an endless number of branches. The Vedic statements have three forms—vidhi (injunction), arthavāda (explanatory passage commending the prescribed action or condemning the prohibited action) and mantra (hymns). Now through all these divisions, branches and forms, the Vedas in their totality teach us the nature of Nārāyaṇa, the supreme Brahman, the mode of worshipping him and the purposes whose fulfilment is brought about by him as a result of such worship. Even as the supreme Person is eternal, the system of words embodying the knowledge concerning him, his worship and the fruits accruing therefrom, is eternal.

२३२. वेदानामनन्तत्वात् दुरवगाहत्वाच्च परमपुरुषनियुक्ताः परमर्षयः

कल्पे कल्पे निखिलजगदुपकारार्थं वेदार्थं स्मृत्वा, विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रमूलानि धर्मशास्त्राणि इतिहासपुराणानि च चक्रुः ।

**232.** As the Vedas are endless and as their import is unfathomably profound, great sages, commissioned by the supreme Being, recollect the import of the Vedas and compose in epoch after epoch the dharma-śāstras, itihāsas, and purāṇas, rooted in the vidhis, arthavādas and mantras, for the welfare of the whole world.

२३३. लौकिकाश्च शब्दा वेदराशेः उद्धृत्यैव तत्तदर्थविशेषनामतया पूर्ववत् प्रयुक्ताः पारम्पर्येण प्रयुज्यन्ते । ननु च वैदिका एव सर्वे वाचकाः शब्दाश्चेत् "छन्दस्येवं भाषायामेवम्" इति लक्षणभेदः कथमुपपद्यते? उच्यते— तेषामेव शब्दानां तस्यामेव आनुपूर्व्यां वर्तमानानां तथैव प्रयोगः; अन्यत्र प्रयुज्यमानानामन्यथेति न कश्चित् दोषः ।

**233.** Even words used in ordinary linguistic practice, have been taken out of the huge mass of Vedic utterances and are used in their various meanings in accordance with previous usage and flow of tradition. If it is asked, 'If all words are Vedic words, why are there separate definitions of the Vedic sense and ordinary sense of words?' the explanation is that when words are used in the pre-established Vedic order, they arry their original significance, and when they are used in a different order, they bear other meanings. There is no flaw in the procedure whatever.

२३४. एवम् इतिहासपुराणधर्मशास्त्रोपबृंहितसाङ्गवेदवेद्यः परब्रह्मभूतः नारायणः निखिलहेयप्रत्यनीकः सकलेतरविलक्षणः अपरिच्छिन्नज्ञानानन्दैकस्वरूपः स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणगणाकरः स्वसङ्कल्पानुविधायिस्वरूपस्थितिप्रवृत्तिभेदचिदचिद्वस्तुजातः अपरिच्छेद्यस्वरूपस्वभावानन्तमहाविभूतिः नानाविधानन्तचेतनाचेतनात्मकप्रपञ्चलीलोपकरणः इति प्रतिपादितम् ।

**234.** Thus the Vedas, along with the auxiliary disciplines, supported by the itihāsas, purāṇas and dharma-śāstras,

impart knowledge about the supreme Brahman. The Brahman knowable through the Vedas is Nārāyaṇa, who is antithetical to all evil, transcendent and unique. In his substantive nature, he is infinite knowledge and bliss. He is an ocean of countless hosts of auspicious attributes, inherent and unlimited in their excellence. All sentient and non-sentient entities, have their nature, existence, activities and mutual differences controlled by his will. His supreme glory is infinite and beyond thought in its nature and attributes. He has as the means of his sport, the entire universe, consisting of multitudinous kinds of countless sentient and non-sentient entities.

२३५. "सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म", "एतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं........तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो", "एनमेके वदन्त्यग्निं मरुतोऽन्ये प्रजापतिम् । इन्द्रमेके परे प्राणम् अपरे ब्रह्म शाश्वतम्", "ज्योतींषि शुक्राणि च यानि लोके त्रयो लोके लोकपालाः त्रयी च । त्रयोऽग्नयश्चाहुतयश्च पञ्च सर्वे देवा देवकीपुत्र एव", "त्वं यज्ञः त्वं वषट्कारः त्वमोङ्कारः परन्तपः", "ऋतधामा वसुः पूर्वः वसूनां त्वं प्रजापतिः", "जगत्सर्वं शरीरं ते स्थैर्यं ते वसुधातलम् । अग्निः कोपः प्रसादस्ते सोमः श्रीवत्सलक्षणः", "ज्योतींषि विष्णुः भुवनानि विष्णुः वनानि विष्णुः गिरयो दिशश्च । नद्यः समुद्राश्च स एव सर्वम् यदस्ति यन्नास्ति च विप्रवर्य" इत्यादि सामानाधिकरण्यप्रयोगेषु सर्वैः शब्दैः सर्वशरीरतया सर्वप्रकारं ब्रह्मैव अभिधीयते इति चोक्तम् ।

**235.** Brahman himself, qualified by all entities as his modes, constituting his body, is signified by all terms in these and similar texts, which are applied to him by way of coordinate predication: 'All this verily is Brahman (*Chā. III, xiv,* 1);' 'All this is ensouled by this .... That thou art, O, Śvetaketu (*Chā. VI, viii,* 7);' 'Some name him Agni, others name him Marut, others again speak of him as Prajāpati. Some others name him Indra. Some others consider him as Prāṇa, and others describe him as the eternal Brahman (*Ma. XII,* 123);' 'All fires, all lights, all the three worlds, all

the divine rulers of worlds, all the Vedas, all the three sacred fires and all the five oblations—all these are the son of Devakī alone (*Bhā.*);' 'Thou art the sacrifice, the sacred vaṣaṭkāra and the holy syllable "Aum". Thou art the destroyer of foes (*Rā. Yuddhakāṇḍa, CXX*, 20);' 'Thou were in the ancient times the Vasu, called Ṛtadhāma, among the Vasus. Thou art Prajāpati (*Rā. Yuddhakāṇḍāa, CXX*, 7);' 'The whole universe is thy body. The earth is thy power of stability. Agni is thy anger, Soma is thy grace, thou art endowed with śrīvatsa-mark (*Rā. Yuddhakāṇḍa, CXX*, 26);' 'The fires are Viṣṇu. The worlds are Viṣṇu. The forests are Viṣṇu. The mountains and quarters are Viṣṇu. The rivers and seas are Viṣṇu. He is all, O Brāhmaṇa, all that is and all that is not (*Vi. VI, v*, 72)'.

२२६. सत्यसङ्कल्पं परं ब्रह्म स्वयमेव "बहुप्रकारं स्याम्" इति सङ्कल्प्य, अचित्समष्टिरूपमहाभूतसूक्ष्मं वस्तु भोक्तृवर्गसमूहं च स्वस्मिन् प्रलीनं स्वयमेव विभज्य, तस्मात् भूतसूक्ष्मात् वस्तुनः महाभूतानि सृष्ट्वा, तेषु च भोक्तृवर्गमात्मतया प्रवेश्य, तैः चिदधिष्ठितैः महाभूतैः अन्योन्यसंसृष्टैः कृत्स्नं जगत् विधाय, स्वयमपि सर्वस्य आत्मतया प्रविश्य, परमात्मत्वेन अवस्थितं सर्वशरीरं बहुप्रकारमवतिष्ठते ।

**236.** The supreme Brahman, whose will becomes irresistably realized, resolved by himself to take up many modes and thought, 'Let me become many'. In him were submerged the great elements in their subtle form, comprising the sum total of non-sentient nature. The aggregate of individual selves was also submerged in him. The Supreme brought them to manifestation through differentiation. Out of the subtle elements he created the great gross elements. He caused the individual selves to enter them as principles of their animation, He then brought into being the whole of this gross world out of those elements, animated by the conscious

principles, through mutual permutations and combinations. Then the supreme Brahman entered into all those entities as their ultimate soul. Thus he exists in the state of effect as the supreme Self with all existence constituting his body. He exists characterized by these as his modes.

२३७. यदिदं महाभूतसूक्ष्मं वस्तु तदेव प्रकृतिशब्देन अभिधीयते । भोक्तृवर्गसमूह एव पुरुषशब्देन उच्यते । तौ च प्रकृतिपुरुषौ परमात्मशरीरतया परमात्मप्रकारभूतौ तत्प्रकारः परमात्मैव प्रकृतिपुरुषशब्दाभिधेयः । "सोऽकामयत, बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति......तत्सृष्ट्वा, तदेवानुप्राविशत्, तदनुप्रविश्य सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्, निरुक्तं चानिरुक्तं च, निलयनं चानिलयनं च, विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च, सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत्" इति पूर्वोक्तं सर्वं अनयैव श्रुत्या व्यक्तम् ।

**237.** The great elements in their primeval subtle condition constitute what is called prakṛti. The sum total of individual selves is called puruṣa. These two, prakṛti and puruṣa, as they are constitutive of the body of the Supreme, are his modes. Thus the Paramātman, himself, with them as his modes, is designated by the terms 'prakṛti' and 'puruṣa'. All that has been so far elaborated on this matter, is brought out clearly even in this single passage: 'He desired, "Let me be many"....; having created that, he entered into that, having entered that, he became the unchanging and the changing, the defined and the undefined, the supporter and the supported, the sentient and the non-sentient. Remaining the real, he became the real and the unreal (*Tai. II*, 6)'.

२३८. ब्रह्मप्राप्त्युपायश्च शास्त्राधिगततत्त्वज्ञानपूर्वक - स्वकर्मानुग्रहीत - भक्तिनिष्ठासाध्यानवधिकातिशयप्रिय-विशदतमप्रत्यक्षतापन्नानुध्यानरूप-परभक्तिरेव इत्युक्तम् । भक्तिशब्दश्च प्रीतिविशेषे वर्तते । प्रीतिश्च ज्ञानविशेष एव ।

**238.** The means for the attainment of Brahman is para-bhakti, which is of the nature of meditation that has become an object of supreme attachment (to the meditator) and has acquired the vividness of clearest perception. This para-bhakti is to be attained through the pathway of devotion, which in its turn is aided by one's performance of his duties after a due understanding of the nature of reality through the scripture. The term bhakti signifies a particular kind of love. (prīti). Love is a particular kind of cognition.

२३९. ननु च सुखं प्रीतिः इत्यनर्थान्तरम्; सुखं च ज्ञानविशेषसाध्यं पदार्थान्तरम् इति लौकिकाः। नैवम्; येन च ज्ञानविशेषेण तत् साध्यमित्युच्यते, स एव ज्ञानविशेषः सुखम् ।

**139.** 'But love is the same thing as joy. Joy, as understood in the world, is something that results from cognition and is other than cognition'. If this objection be raised, we answer that the truth is not so. The cognition which is said to result in joy, is itself that joy.

२४०. एतदुक्तं भवति—विषयज्ञानानि सुखदुःखमध्यस्थसाधारणानि । तानि च विषयाधीनविशेषाणि तथा भवन्ति । येन च विषयविशेषेण विशेषितं ज्ञानं सुखस्य जनकमित्यभिमतं, तद्विषयज्ञानमेव सुखम् । तदतिरेकिपदार्थान्तरं नोपलभ्यते । तेनैव सुखित्वव्यवहारोपपत्तेश्च ।

**240.** To Explain: Cognition of objects is common to all the three types of experiences—joy, pain and emotional neutrality. Cognition, which depends upon its objective content for its specific quality, acquires the aforesaid qualities (of joy or pain or the neutral state) as determined by its objective content. The cognition of that object—the cognition qualified by which object is said to lead to joy—is itself the joy in question. Nothing other than this cognition can be discerned in the experience of joy. By this cognition itself the experience of joy is accounted for.

२४१. एवंविधसुखरूपज्ञानस्य विशेषकत्वं ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तस्य वस्तुनः सातिशयम् अस्थिरं च; ब्रह्मणस्तु अनवधिकातिशयं स्थिरं च इति, "आनन्दो ब्रह्म" इत्युच्यते विषयायत्तत्वात् ज्ञानस्य सुखरूपतया ब्रह्मैव सुखम् ।

**241.** Entities other than Brahman can be objects of such cognitions of the nature of joy only to a finite extent and for limited duration. But Brahman is such that cognizing of him is an infinite and abiding joy. It is for this reason that the śruti says, 'Brahman is bliss (*Tai. II* , 6)'. Since the form of cognition as joy is determined by its object, Brahman itself is joy.

२४२. तदिदमाह—"रसो वै सः, रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति" इति । ब्रह्मैव सुखम् इति, ब्रह्म लब्ध्वा सुखी भवतीत्यर्थः । परमपुरुषः स्वेनैव स्वयमनवधिकातिशयसुखस्सन् परस्यापि सुखं भवति, सुखरूपत्वाविशेषात्; ब्रह्म यस्य ज्ञानविषयो भवति स सुखी भवति इत्यर्थः ।

**242.** This has been so stated in the sacred text, 'He is rasa; attaining this rasa, the cognizer becomes blissful (*Tai. II*, 7)'. It means that, as Brahman is joy, the person who attains Brahman becomes joyous. The supreme Puruṣa is unsurpassed and infinite joy by himself and in himself. He becomes the joy of another also, as his nature as joy is absolute and universal. When Brahman becomes the object of one's contemplation, he (the meditator) becomes blissful.

२४३. तदेवं परस्य ब्रह्मणः अनवधिकातिशयासङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणाकरस्य निरवद्यस्य अनन्तमहाविभूतेः अनवधिकातिशयसौशील्यवात्सल्यसौन्दर्यजलधेः, सर्वशेषित्वात्, आत्मनः शेषत्वात्, प्रतिसम्बधितया अनुसन्धीयमानम् अनवधिकातिशयप्रीतिविषयं सत् परं ब्रह्मैव एनमात्मानं प्रापयति इति ।

**243.** Thus the supreme Brahman is the ocean of infinite and unsurpassed excellences of attributes. He transcends all evil. The expanse of his glory is boundless. He abounds in

surpassing condescension, maternal compassion and supreme beauty. He is the principal entity (śeṣin). The individual self is subservient to him. If a seeker meditates on the Supreme with a full consciousness of this relationship (between the Lord and himself) as the principal entity and subsidiary entity, and if the supreme Brahman so meditated upon becomes an object of supreme love to the devotee, then he himself effectuates the devotee's god-realization.

२४४. ननु च अत्यन्तशेषतैव आत्मनः अनवधिकातिशयं सुखमित्युक्तं भवति, तदेतत् सर्वलोकविरुद्धम् । तथा हि—सर्वेषामेव चेतनानां स्वातन्त्र्यमेव इष्टतमं दृश्यते, पारतन्त्र्यं दुःखतरम्; स्मृतिश्च—"सर्वं परवशं दुःखं सर्वमात्मवशं सुखम्"; तथा च "सेवा श्ववृत्तिराख्याता तस्मात्तां परिवर्जयेत्" इति ।

**244. (Objection):** 'It is maintained that absolute subordination is the highest joy for the soul. This is opposed to the understanding of the whole world. All sentient beings have independence as the highest object of desire. Dependence is extremely painful. Smṛti also says, 'All dependence on others is painful. All self-dependence is happiness (*Ma. IV*, 160)' and again, 'Service is a dog's life. Therefore one should give it up (*Ma. IV*, 6)'.

२४५. तदिदम् अनधिगतदेहातिरिक्तात्मस्वरूपाणां शरीरात्माभिमानविजृम्भितम्; तथा हि—शरीरं हि मनुष्यत्वादिजातिगुणाश्रयपिण्डभूतं स्वतन्त्रं प्रतीयते; तस्मिन्नेव "अहम्" इति संसारिणां प्रतीतिः; आत्माभिमानो यादृशः तदनुगुणैव पुरुषार्थप्रतीतिः; सिंहव्याघ्रवराहमनुष्ययक्षरक्षःपिशाचदेवदानवस्त्रीपुंसव्यवस्थितात्माभिमानानां सुखानि व्यवस्थितानि, तानि च परस्परविरुद्धानि; तस्मात् आत्माभिमानानुगुणपुरुषार्थव्यवस्थया सर्वं समाहितम् ।

**245. (Reply):** This is the attitude of those who have failed to comprehend the nature of the self as different from

the body, and is due to their mistaken attachment to the body as the self. To explain: The body is the individual locus of the attributes like the generic character connoted by terms like man, god, etc., and is taken to be an independent entity. The individual self caught up in the transmigratory circle of existence, looks upon the body as 'I'. The conception of value is determined by the conception of the self. The individual selves looking upon themselves as lions, tigers, bears, men, yakṣas, rākṣasas, piśācas, gods, demons, females and males, have corresponding and mutually separate conceptions of what is to be desired and what is to be avoided. These various conceptions of value are mutually contradictory. Therefore, the whole position is cleared up and explained on the principle that what an individual pursues as a desirable end depends upon what he conceives himself to be.

२४६. आत्मस्वरूपं तु देवादिदेहविलक्षणं ज्ञानैकाकारम्; तच्च परशेषतैकस्वरूपम् । यथावस्थितात्माभिमाने तदनुगुणैव पुरुषार्थप्रतीतिः । "आत्मा ज्ञानमयोऽमलः" इति स्मृतेः ज्ञानैकाकारता प्रतिपन्ना; "पतिं विश्वस्य" इत्यादिश्रुतिगणैः परमात्मशेषतैकाकारता च प्रतिपादिता; अतः सिंहव्याघ्रादिशरीरात्माभिमानवत्, स्वतन्त्राभिमानोऽपि कर्मकृतविपरीतात्मज्ञानरूपो वेदितव्यः ।

**246.** In reality the nature of the self is that it is different from the body, that it is of the nature of consciousness and that in its essence it is subsidiary to the Supreme. When the individual forms a true conception of himself, he pursues ends that accord with that conception. That the nature of the self is consciousness is stated by the smṛti text, 'The self is full of knowledge and is pure (*Vi. VI., vii,* 22)'. The śruti texts like 'He is the Lord of the universe (*Mahā.*)', propound that the individual self's nature is to be subservient to the supreme Self. Therefore it is to be understood that, as the conception of oneself as lion or tiger is due to the misappre-

hension of the self arising from karma, even so is the conception of oneself as self-dependent.

२४७. अतः कर्मकृतमेव परमपुरुषव्यतिरिक्तविषयाणां सुखत्वम्; अत एव तेषाम् अल्पत्वम् अस्थिरत्वं च। परमपुरुषस्यैव स्वत एव सुखत्वम्। अतः तदेव स्थिरम् अनवधिकातिशयं च, "कं ब्रह्म, खं ब्रह्म", "आनन्दो ब्रह्म", "सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म" इति श्रुतेः।

**247.** Therefore, the value of everything, other than the supreme Person, is due only to karma. Hence they are trivial and transitory. Only the supreme Person is intrinsically of the nature of joy. Hence only the joy in him is infinite and abiding. The śruti says, 'Brahman is bliss, Brahman is ākāśa' (*Cha. IV, X*, 5)', 'Brahman is bliss (*Tai. III*, 6)' and 'Brahman is real, knowledge and infinite (*Tai. II*, 1)'.

२४८. ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तस्य कृत्स्नस्य वस्तुनः स्वरूपेण सुखत्वाभावः कर्मकृतत्वेन च अस्थिरत्वं भगवता पराशरेण उक्तम् —

नरकस्वर्गसंज्ञे वै पापपुण्ये द्विजोत्तम ।।
वस्त्वेकमेव दुःखाय सुखायेर्ष्यागमाय च ।
कोपाय च यतस्तस्मात् वस्तु वस्त्वात्मकं कुतः ।।

सुखदुःखाद्येकान्तरूपेण वस्तुनो वस्तुत्वं कुतः? तदेकान्तता पुण्यपापकृतेत्यर्थः।

**248.** Bhagavān Parāśara has set forth in the following verses how everything other than Brahman lacks intrinsic power to bring joy, and whatever joy we happen to derive from them is therefore transient, being determined by karma: 'O Brāhmaṇa, by hell and heaven only demerit and merit are meant (*Vi. II*, *vi*, 44). The same object causes pain, pleasure, envy and anger. Therefore, how can these features like causing pleasure etc. be the essential nature of the object? (*Vi. II*,, *vi*, 45)'. How can the causation of pleasure or pain be the universal and necessary nature of any object? The only universal and necessary factor in the causation of pleasure and pain is the determination by karma. This is the idea.

२४९. एवम् अनेकपुरुषापेक्षया कस्यचित् सुखमेव कस्यचित् दुःखं भवति इत्यव्यवस्थां प्रतिपाद्य, एकस्मिन्नपि पुरुषे न व्यवस्थितमित्याह—

तदेव प्रीतये भूत्वा पुनः दुःखाय जायते ।
तदेव कोपाय यतः प्रसादाय च जायते ॥
तस्मात् दुःखात्मकं नास्ति न च किञ्चित्सुखात्मकम् । इति ।

सुखदुःखात्मकत्वं सर्वस्य वस्तुनः कर्मकृतं, न वस्तुस्वरूपकृतम्; अतः कर्मावसाने तदपैति इत्यर्थः ।

**249.** After thus determining the variability and relativity of the nature of empirical sources of pleasure and pain in relation to different individuals, he goes on to show that empirical objects do not behave consistently even in relation to a single person: 'The same object, which please at one time, comes to cause pain at another time; the same causes anger at one time and at a later moment brings about tranquility (*Vi. II, VI*,, 46). There is nothing that is pleasant in its inherent nature and nothing that is painful in itself (*Vi. II, vi*, 47)'. It thus gets explained that all objects are pleasurable or painful through the force of karma and not through their intrinsic nature and therefore on the liquidation of the determining karma, the particular effects by way of pleasure and pain disappear.

२५०. यत्तु "सर्वं परवशं दुःखम्" इत्युक्तं, तत् परमपुरुषव्यतिरिक्तानां परस्परशेषशेषिभावाभावात् तद्व्यतिरिक्तं प्रति शेषता दुःखमेव इत्युक्तम् । "सेवा श्ववृत्तिराख्याता" इत्यत्रापि असेव्यसेवा श्ववृत्तिरेव इत्युक्तम् । "स ह्याश्रमैः सदोपास्यः समस्तैः एक एव तु" इति सर्वैः आत्मयाथात्म्यविद्भिः सेव्यः पुरुषोत्तम एक एव । यथोक्तं भगवता—

मां च योऽव्यभिचारेण भक्तियोगेन सेवते ।
स गुणान् समतीत्यैतान् ब्रह्मभूयाय कल्पते ॥ इति ।

**250.** The statement 'All dependence is painful' simply means that dependence on anything or anyone other than the

supreme Person is painful, because there is no relationship of the principal entity and the subsidiary between anyone other than Brahman and oneself. 'Service is a dog's life' also means that service of one who is unworthy of service is dog's life. The following text says that the only one that ought to be served by all who are enlightened about the fundamental nature of the self, is the highest Puruṣa: 'He is to be served by people in all stages of life. He alone is to be served by all.' The Lord says, 'He who serves me, following the path of undivided bhakti, transcends these qualities (of prakṛti) and will attain self-realization (*Gītā*, *XIV*, 26)'.

२५१. इयमेव भक्तिरूपा सेवा "ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्", "तमेवं विद्वानमृत इह भवति", "ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मैव भवति" इत्यादिषु वेदनशब्देनाभिधीयते इत्युक्तम् । "यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यः" इति विशेषणात् "यमेवैष वृणुते" इति भगवता वरणीयत्वं प्रतीयते; वरणीयश्च प्रियतमः; यस्य भगवति अनवधिकातिशया प्रीतिः जायते स एव भगवतः प्रियतमः । तदुक्तं भगवतैव—"प्रियो हि ज्ञानिनोऽत्यर्थमहं स च मम प्रियः" इति । तस्मात् परभक्तिरूपापन्नमेव वेदनं तत्त्वतो भगवत्प्राप्तिसाधनम् ।

**251.** It has already been elucidated that it is only this service of the form of bhakti that is spoken of as knowledge in the texts, 'One who *knows* Brahman attains the Highest (*Tai. II*, 1)', 'He who *knows* him becomes immortal here (*Pu.* 20)' and 'He who *knows* Brahman becomes Brahman (*Mu. III*, *ii*, 9)'. In the other text qualifying this knowledge, 'This ātman is attained by one, whom he chooses', the clause, 'whom he chooses' conveys the idea of the seeker becoming an object of choice to the Bhagavān. He comes to be chosen, who is the object of greatest love. He becomes the object of greatest love to the Lord in whom has arisen supreme love for the Lord. The Bhagavān says, 'I am ineffably dear to the man of knowledge and he is also dear to me (*Gītā*,

*VII*, 17)'. Therefore in reality, only knowledge that is of the nature of supreme bhakti is the means for attaining the Bhagavān.

२५२. यथोक्तं भगवता द्वैपायनेन मोक्षधर्मे सर्वोपनिषद्व्याख्यानरूपम् —
न सन्दृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य न चक्षुषा पश्यति कश्चनैनम् ।
भक्तया च धृत्या च समाहितात्मा ज्ञानस्वरूपं परिपश्यतीह ॥ इति ।
धृत्या समाहितात्मा भक्तया पुरुषोत्तमं पश्यति साक्षात्करोति, प्राप्नोति इत्यर्थः; "भक्तया त्वनन्यया शक्यः" इत्यनेन ऐकार्थ्यात् । भक्तिश्च ज्ञानविशेष एव इति सर्वमुपपन्नम् ।

**252.** Bhagavān Dvaipāyana has enunciated this truth in the *Mokṣadharma* and has thereby furnished a commentary on the whole of the Upaniṣads. He says, 'His form does not fall within the range of perception. No one sees him with his eyes. He, whose mind has been brought to the state of samādhi by determined effort, sees him who is of the nature of knowledge, through bhakti'. The meaning is that one who by determined effort fixes his whole mind on the supreme Puruṣa, sees him *through bhakti.* Here 'seeing' means direct perception, and 'direct perception' means attainment. It is thus that the passage would be one in meaning with the Lord's declaration, 'I am attainable only through undivided bhakti (*Gītā*, *XI*, 54)'. Bhakti, therefore is only a special form of knowledge. Thus the explanation is complete and satisfactory.

सारासारविवेकज्ञाः गरीयांसो विमत्सराः ।
प्रमाणतंत्राः सन्तीति कृतो वेदार्थसङ्ग्रहः ॥

This work, *Vedārtha-saṅgraha*, has been composed in the hope that there are persons who are gifted with discriminative insight into what is essential and non-essential, who are endowed with breadth of vision and openness of mind and who are solely guided by the pramāṇas.

The following are some of the sacred texts that are compressed in the description in Paragraph No. 220

## दिव्यमङ्गलविग्रहनिरूपकप्रमाणानि

1. "योऽसौ आदित्यमण्डलान्तर्वर्ती" — "य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषो दृश्यते" (छा. १, ६, ६); "य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषः यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन्" (बृ. ७, ५, १); "य एष एतस्मिन् मण्डलेऽर्चिषि पुरुषः" (तै. ना. ६, १३); ध्येयः सदा सवितृमण्डलमध्यवर्ती नारायणः सरसिजासनसन्निविष्टः । केयूरवान् मकरकुण्डलवान् किरीटी हारी हिरण्मयवपुः धृतशङ्खचक्रः ॥ (बृहत्पराशरस्मृतिः, ५).

2. "तप्तकार्तस्वरगिरिवरप्रभः" — "रुक्माभं स्वप्नधीगम्यं" (म. स्मृ. १३, १२२); "यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णम्" (मुं. ३, १, ३); "प्रतप्तकार्तस्वरवर्चसं प्रभुम्" ।

3. "सहस्रांशुशतसहस्रकिरणः" — "आदित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्" (पु. सू. २०); "दिवि सूर्यसहस्रस्य भवेद्युगपदुत्थिता । यदि भाः सदृशी सा स्याद्भासस्तस्य महात्मनः ॥" (गी. ११. १२).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. | "गम्भीराम्भस्समुद्भूतसुमृष्टनालरविकरविकसितपुण्डरीकदलामलायतेक्षणः" | "तस्य यथा कप्यासं पुण्डरीकमेवमक्षिणी" (छा. उ. १. ६ ७); "रामः कमलपत्राक्षः" (रा. सुं. ३५, ८); "पुण्डरीकपलाशाभ्यां विप्रकीर्णमिवोदकम्" (रा. सुं. ३. ३४); "प्रसन्नवदनं चारुपद्मपत्रोपमेक्षणं" (वि. पु. ६, ७, ८०) "त्वत्तः कमलपत्राक्ष" (गी. ११, २); "जितन्ते पुण्डरीकाक्ष"। |
| 5. | "सुभ्रूललाटः सुनासः सुस्मिताधरविद्रुमः" | "नारायण नमस्तेऽस्तु पुण्डरीकायतेक्षण । सुभ्रूललाट सुनस सुस्मिताधरविद्रुम ॥" (जितन्ते ४, ६) |
| 6. | "सुरुचिरकोमलगण्डः" | "सुकपोलम्" (वि. पु. ६, ७, ८०) |
| 7. | "कम्बुग्रीवः" | "कम्बुग्रीवो महाहनुः" (रा. बा. १. ९) |
| 8. | "पीनवृत्तायतभुजः" | "पीनवृत्तायतभुज श्रीवत्सकृतलक्षण" (जितन्ते ४, ७) |
| 9. | "चारुतराताम्रकरतलानुरक्ताङ्गुलीभिरलङ्कृतः, तनुमध्यः, विशालवक्षस्थलः" | "महोरस्को महेष्वासः" (रा. बा. १. १०) |
| 10. | "समविभक्तसर्वाङ्गः" | "समः समविभक्ताङ्गः" (रा. सुं. ३५, १६) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 11. | "**अनिर्देश्यदिव्यरूपसंहननः**" | "रूपसंहननं लक्ष्मीं" (रा. अरण्य. १. १३) |
| 12. | "**स्निग्धवर्णः**" | "स्निग्धवर्णः प्रतापवान्" (रा. सुं. ३५, १६) |
| 13. | "**प्रबुद्धपुण्डरीकचारुचरणयुगलः**" | "त्वत्पादकमलादन्यत्" (जितन्ते १, १०) "सञ्चिन्तयेत् भगवतश्चरणारविन्दम्" (भाग. ३, २८, २१) |
| 14. | "**स्वानुरूपपीताम्बरधरः**" | "तस्य महारजतं वासः" (बृ. ४, ३, ६) |
| 15. | "**अमलकिरीटकुण्डलहारकौस्तुभकेयूरकटकनूपुरोदरबन्धनाद्यपरिमिताश्चर्यानन्तदिव्यभूषणः**" | "केयूरवान् मकरकुण्डलवान् किरीटी हारी हिरण्मयवपुः धृतशङ्खचक्रः" (बृहत्पराशरस्मृतिः, ५) |
| 16. | "**शङ्खचक्रगदासिशार्ङ्गश्रीवत्सवनमालालङ्कृतः**" | "शङ्खभृन्नन्दकी चक्री शार्ङ्गधन्वा गदाधरः । रथाङ्गपाणिरक्षोभ्यः सर्वप्रहरणायुधः ॥" (वि. सहस्रनाम) |
| 17. | "**अनवधिकातिशयसौन्दर्याहृताशेषमनोदृष्टिवृत्तिः**" | "रूपौदार्यगुणैः पुंसां दृष्टिचित्तापहारिणम्" (रा. अयोध्या. ३, २९) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18. | "लावण्यामृतपूरिताशेषचराचर-भूतजातः" | "भुवनसुन्दर" (भाग. १०, ५२, ३७); "साक्षान्मन्मथमन्मथः" (भाग. १०, ३२, २) |
| 19. | "अत्यद्भुताचिन्त्यनित्ययौवनः" | "यः पूर्व्याय वेधसे नवीयसे" (ऋ. १. १५६. २) |
| 20. | "पुष्पहाससुकुमारः" | "सौकुमार्यं सुवेषताम्" (रा. अरण्य. १, १३); "पुष्पहासः" (वि. सहस्रनाम) |
| 21. | "पुण्यगन्धवासितानन्तदिगन्तरालः" | "सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः" (छा. ३, १४, ४); "तस्याननं पद्मसमानगन्धि" (रा. सुं. ३६, २८) |
| 22. | "त्रैलोक्याक्रमणप्रवृत्तगम्भीरभावः" | "समुद्र इव गाम्भीर्ये" (रा. बा. १, १७) |
| 23. | "करुणानुरागमधुरलोचनावलोकिताश्रितवर्गः" | "करुणापूर्णदृष्टिभ्यां दीनं मामवलोकय" (जितन्ते. २, १२)<br>"भूत्यानुकम्पितधियेह गृहीतमूर्तेः सञ्चिन्तयेद्भगवतो वदनारविन्दम् ।" (भाग. ३, २८, २९)<br>"तस्यावलोकमधिकं कृपयातिघोरतापत्रयोपशमनाय निसृष्टमक्ष्णोः ।<br>स्निग्धस्मितानुगुणितं विपुलप्रसादं ध्यायेच्चिरं विपुलभावनया गुहायाम् ॥" (भाग. ३, २८, ३१) |